THE APOLOGY OF *Benjamin Ben Mordecai* TO HIS FRIENDS, FOR EMBRACING CHRISTIANITY;

IN SEVEN LETTERS To ELISHA LEVI, Merchant, of *Amſterdam*.

TOGETHER WITH

An EIGHTH LETTER, ON THE GENERATION OF JESUS CHRIST.

WITH NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

THE SECOND EDITION, WITH ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS, AND A COPIOUS INDEX.

By HENRY TAYLOR, A. M.
RECTOR of *Crawley*, and VICAR of *Portſmouth*, in HANTS.

Exiſtimabam, pro Veritate, certandum; & quidem tali, qualem animo approbarem: fruſtra enim daturum me operam ut perſuaderem aliis quæ non mihi perſuaſiſſem. GROT. de Ver.

Ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν περὶ τῶν ὡς ἴδιον καὶ ἀνέγνων, ὅπως ἔγραψα· οἱ δὲ τις ἄλλως δοξάζειν βουλήσεται περὶ αὐτῶν, ἀνέγκλητον ἔχέτω τὴν ἱεροσυνωμοσύνην.
Jos. Antiq. Lib. X. ad fin.

VOLUME THE FIRST.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR
C. DILLY, in the *Poultry*; and R. ROBSON, *New Bond-Street*.
M.DCC.LXXXIV.

APOLOGY

OF

Benjamin Ben Mordecai

TO HIS FRIENDS,

FOR EMBRACING

CHRISTIANITY;

IN

SEVEN LETTERS

To ELISHA LEVI, Merchant, of Amsterdam.

TOGETHER WITH THE

FOURTH LETTER,

ON THE

GENERATION OF JESUS CHRIST.

WITH

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

THIS SECOND EDITION, WITH

ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS, NOW FIRST PUBLISHED.

By HENRY TAYLOR,

Author of Classic Lays, Visions, &c.

VOLUME THE FIRST.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR

C. DILLY, in the Poultry; and R. ROBSON, New Bond Street.

M DCC LXXXV.

TO THE

READER.

THE Author of these Papers hath long observed that the World is halting between two very opposite Opinions with regard to the *Nature of Christ*; some believing him to be the Supreme God; which is inconsistent with his Sufferings and Death; and others believing that he had no Existence before his Birth of the Virgin *Mary*, which is inconsistent with the whole account of his Humiliation and Descent from Heaven to be made Flesh: these Opinions therefore

being both of them irreconcilable with the Scriptures, the Writer humbly conceives it may be of ſervice to the *Chriſtian* Cauſe to lay before the World a third Opinion, which lies between theſe two Extremes, viz. that *Jeſus Chriſt* was the Angel of the Covenant or viſible *Jehovah*, who ſo often appeared to the Patriarchs in Shechinah, and gave the Law. This was the Opinion of the Ancients before the Council of *Nice*, till it was rejected by *Auſtin* (*a*) to make way for the Doctrine of the Conſubſtantiality, which has rendered the whole Syſtem of *Chriſtianity* unintelligible, and undermined the *Chriſtian* Faith (*b*). But upon the revival of Learning, when our Divines found themſelves unable to explain the Scripture upon any other Principle, they were obliged to return to the Faith they had ſo long rejected.

And when the *Athanaſian* and *Socinian* writers have effectually expoſed one another's miſtakes without getting rid of their own; when they ſhall have ſettled the

(*a*) See Let. I. p. 58. (*b*) Let. III. Poſtſc.

various

various reading of an ω or an ο in *Juſtin's Trypho*, and agree about the Conſtruction of his Greek; when they have ranſacked all Antiquity for the Opinion of the *Nazarens*, *Mineans*, and *Ebionites*, with as much Zeal as if their Faith depended upon it, and all to no Purpoſe; their Difficulties ſtill remaining; it is not improbable that the Divines of the next Generation will conſider the Subject more coolly, and upon another Footing than thoſe who are now concerned in the Diſpute, and find the Principle I am defending, will ſupply the only KEY that is able to open and diſcover the Conſiſtency between the *Chriſtian* and *Jewiſh* Revelations, and form one plain and rational Syſtem from the beginning to the end of Time; agreeably to the Nature and Attributes of God, and the common Notions and Principles of Mankind.

The Divines quoted in the Third Letter as favouring the Notion here maintained are Dr. *Allix*, Bp. *Bull*, Mr. *Poole*, Mr. *Pyle*, the *Dutch* Annotators, *Vatablus*, *Caſtalio*, *Clarius*, *Junius*, *Piſcator*, *Calvin*, *Ainſ-*

Ainſworth, Abp. *Teniſon*, Bp. *Pearſon*, Bp. *Burnet*, Dr. *Sam. Clarke*, Dr. *Sykes*, Mr. *Lowth*, &c. &c. and the ancient Fathers who held the ſame Opinion were *Irenæus*, *Clement Alex.* *Tertullian*, *Hippolitus*, *Theophilus*, the Councils of *Antioch* and *Sirmium*, *Novatian*, *Hilary*, *Ambroſe*, *Cyril*, *Juſtin Martyr*, *Euſebius*, &c. &c. See Letter III.

But as the moſt important Truths, when they have been out of faſhion for ſome time, as Abp. *Laud* obſerves, in his Diſpute with *Fiſher*, are looked upon as Novelties; it is to avoid this Objection, that I quote theſe great Names, depending entirely for the Solution of the Queſtion upon the Scripture ONLY: and as the Doctrine here maintained appeared to me at firſt from no other Authority, and the Opinions of the Fathers afterwards ſerved merely as confirmations of that Senſe of Scripture; I have not the leaſt Doubt but the ſame Truth will appear to every one who carefully examines, without prejudice, the Texts upon which it is founded.

The

The first Edition of these Letters has been published about twelve Years; and I have seen no Answer that appears to me of any importance. I know what precious work may be made by trusting to the Authority of Commentators in explaining every Text agreeably to their particular Theories and Sects (for he must be very dull indeed who is not able to make the Text speak whatever he pleases, if he considers it as detached and unconfined by the Context, and the general Scope and Design of the whole Revelation). Till all these agree, the Sense of every Text will be precarious and uncertain; and when they all agree, they will support one another: And this is the only Evidence I depend upon, for the Truth of the following Pages.

In the INDEX,

For *Melichor*, read Melchior.

Morgan, read Morgan's Objection in *the* Minute Philoſopher, 326.

CONTENTS

OF THE

FIRST LETTER AND NOTES.

INTRODUCTION — — — — Page 1
Chriſtians unjuſtly accuſed of Polytheiſm — 3
Whence that notion aroſe — — — — — 11
The fatal effects of Diviſion among Chriſtians — 13
Their variety of Syſtems, to preſerve the Unity 18
Who the perſon is, that is called *Chriſt* — — 20
The diviſion of the whole ſubject — — — 24
The opinion of the *Sabellians* — — — 25
——————— *Socinians* — — — 30
——————— *Arians* — — — — 36
——————— *Orthodox* — — — 45
Orthodoxy of the Church different, in different Ages — — — — — — — 46
The progreſs of Orthodoxy — — — 55
Orthodoxy of the firſt ages after the Apoſtles — ib.
——————— of the *Platonic* Chriſtians — — ib.
——————— at *Nice* — — — — 59
——————— of *Cyril*, &c. — — — — 62
——————— of the Council of *Lateran* — — 65

CONTENTS.

	Page
Difference of *Nominals* and *Realiſts* — —	68
——— of *Realiſts* among themſelves — —	71
Opinion of Dr. *Waterland* and the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians* — — — — — —	77
Theſe opinions examined — — — —	79
Perſon what — — — — —	85
If the Son and Holy Ghoſt are *ſupreme*, they are *ſelf-exiſtent* — — — — —	86
If three *ſupreme*, then three *Gods* — — —	ib.
Chriſt not ſupreme God, as to his Perſon —	87
The *Pſeudo-Athanaſians* worſhip a Creature —	91
If Chriſt be ſupreme God, he could not ſuffer —	92
Whether Chriſt be two Natures, God and Man -	94
This doctrine heretical — — — —	95
Scripture ſenſe of the word *Man* — — —	97
Opinion of *Apollinaris* — — — —	99
Of the words *Soul* and *Spirit* — — —	103
Opinion of *Irenæus* — — — —	106
The whole Chriſt ſuffered — — —	108
Biſhop *Pearſon*'s opinion, inconſiſtent with Revelation — — — — —	113
Dr. *Waterland*'s opinion, inconſiſtent with natural Religion — — — — —	129
Opinion of the *Scripturarians* concerning the Trinity — — — — — —	137
Concluſions from the whole — — —	140
The doctrine of the Trinity, no objection to Chriſtianity — — — —	ib.
Scripture the only rule of Faith — — —	145
The apoſtaſy and wickedneſs of the Chriſtians, no objection to Chriſtianity — — —	148

NOTES.

CONTENTS.

NOTES.

		Page
Note I.	*SEPHER Ikkarim* quoted	151
II.	The *Chriſtians* hold only One God	ib.
III.	The *Jews* depend on the *Talmud* traditions	ib.
IV.	The *Chriſtians* never were agreed in the ſenſe of the Propoſitions they diſputed about	153
V.	Of the word *Creature*	158
VI.	Of the words *Eternal*, &c.	160
VII.	Of the *Generation* of the Son of God	165
VIII.	Of the Trinity of one ſingular Eſſence	166
IX.	Of the *Arians*	168
X.	Favourers of the *Arians*	182
XI.	*Daillé* concerning the difficulty of finding the Truth in the Writings of the Fathers	186
XII.	*Papiſts* deny, that the Trinity can be proved from Scripture or the Ancients	187
XIII.	The Fathers, who held a Generation of the world *in tempora*	187
XIV.	The Fathers, who held Chriſt to be the Angel of the Covenant	188
XV.	*Epiſcopius* quoted, concerning the *Nicene* Creed	ib.
XVI.	Of the School of *Alexandria*	ib.
XVII.	The Son believed equal to the Father in Eſſence only	203
XVIII.	Of *Apollinaris*	207
XIX.	*Bernard Gilpin* quoted, concerning Biſhop *Tunſtal*	212

CONTENTS.

	Page
XX. Of the Council of *Lateran* ——	212
XXI. The five Trinities mentioned in the Unitarian Tracts —— ——	213
XXII. The Trinity of St. *Auguſtine* and the Reformed Churches —— ——	214
XXIII. *Euſebius* and *Euſtathius* accuſe one another —— ——	216
XXIV. *Chillingworth* quoted, concerning *Subſtance* —— ——	ib.
XXV. *Hilary* quoted, concerning the *Paſſion* of Chriſt —— ——	ib.
XXVI. *Ignatius*, &c. quoted, for the opinion of *Apollinaris* —— ——	217
XXVII. *Cunæus* quoted, concerning the *Jews'* care of the Bible —— ——	218
XXVIII. *Maimonides'* deſcription of the Unity of God —— ——	ib.
XXIX. Of the *Athanaſian* Creed ——	ib.
XXX. Of the *Hebrew* word יחד ——	222
XXXI. Of the Unity —— ——	223

CONTENTS

OF THE

SECOND LETTER.

Page

THE deſign; to ſhew whether *Chriſt* anſwers the deſcription of the *Meſſiah* in the Propheſies —— —— 227

Jehovah ſometimes appeared and converſed with Men, perſonally; and not in Dream or Viſion —— —— 230

Yet the *Supreme God* never appeared nor ſpake to Men. *Juſtin Martyr*, *Maimonides*, *Voſſius*, Archbiſhop *Tenniſon*, quoted —— ib.

Biſhop *Bull*'s remark —— —— 231

The *Jehovah* that appeared, was therefore the *Angel* of the Supreme *Jehovah* —— ib.

Why called by that Name —— —— 233

Proved from his appearance to *Hagar*, and to *Moſes*, and to *Abraham*, and to *Jacob*; and his going before the Camp of the *Iſraelites*, and his appearance to *Moſes* and the Elders of *Iſrael*, and his contending with *Jacob* — 237

The Hiſtory of the Fact, how this Name was put on him —— —— 239

Seeing

Page

Seeing the *Face of God*, explained of his *Angel* 244
He was known to be the Angel of the Supreme *Jehovah*, by *Moſes* and the Patriarchs 246
He ſpake in the name of God as his Meſſenger ib.
Whether the viſible *Jehovah* was God himſelf, or *Jehovah* himſelf; as aſſerted by *Allix*, *Pearſon*, *Bull*, &c. —— —— 249
To be examined, whether *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian* Revelations were carried-on by the Viſible *Jehovah*; i. e. the *Logos*. The Affirmative ſhewn —— —— 257
1ſt, By the Reaſon and Conſiſtency of the thing. *Whichcote* quoted—The Opinion of the modern *Chriſtians* upon the Subject —— 257
The Opinion of the Ancients —— —— 259
Many Difficulties avoided by this ſuppoſition 262
2. The Queſtion examined by Scripture —— 264
Ben Saddai's Objection, that *Chriſt* is never called *Jehovah* in the New Teſtament, &c. 276
His Objection anſwered —— —— 278
Why *Chriſt* was not called *Jehovah* in the New Teſtament —— —— 279
Yet the word *Jehovah* is tranſlated by the word Κύριος in the New Teſtament, by which name he is called —— —— ib.
And ſometimes can mean no other perſon —— ib.
1. All the Evangeliſts underſtand *Chriſt* to be the viſible *Jehovah* —— —— 282
2. It appears from his creating the Heaven and the Earth —— —— 284
3. From the deſcription of the viſible *Jehovah* and *Logos* compared —— —— 285
4. From St. *John*'s deſcription of the Glory of the *Logos*, compared with the account given by *Moſes* —— —— 286
5. From the Glory of *Chriſt*, ſpoken-of by the Prophets and Apoſtles —— 289

CONTENTS.

Page

6. From the appearance of the *Shechinah*, and St. *John*'s explanation of the Viſion of *Iſaiah*, v. 1. —— —— 290
7. From St. *Paul*'s referring to *Chriſt*, as accompanying the *Jews* in the Wilderneſs —— 292
8. And declaring that they tempted *Chriſt* 294
9. And it was He who ſhook the Earth and ſpake from Mount *Sinai* —— —— 295
10. From the Ages or Diſpenſation being diſpoſed and ordered by him —— 296
11. From St. *Paul*'s explaining the Propheſy of *Joel* to refer to *Chriſt* —— —— 296
12. From St. *Paul*'s explaining *Moſes* to have regard to the reproach of *Chriſt* —— 297
13. From St. *Peter*'s declaring, that it was *Chriſt* who preached in the days of *Noah* —— 299
14. Becauſe the Temple was called *Chriſt*'s Temple —— —— 300
15. And the *Jews* His People —— 301
16. And St. *Paul* refers to His Rule over them before his advent in the Fleſh —— 303
17. This Doctrine fully confirmed by *Chriſt*; in his Lamentation over *Jeruſalem* —— 305

The Concluſions from the foregoing Proofs 311

Five Rules; to judge *when* the Viſible *Jehovah* is ſpoke-of under the Name *Jehovah* —— 312

POSTSCRIPT. In which *Grotius*'s Objections to this Belief are examined —— 316

CONTENTS

OF THE

THIRD LETTER.

Page

THAT the *Logos* was the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, or Viſible *Jehovah*, proved from the moſt ancient and approved Commentators, both *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian* —— ——

The *Targum* of *Onkelos* explains *Jehovah* by *Mimara Jehovæ*, the *Word* of *Jehovah*; anſwering to the *Logos* of St. *John* —— 340

And the *Jeruſalem* Paraphraſt alſo — — 342

Mimara never uſed by them, but when they underſtood the *ſecond* Perſon of the Trinity to be meaned —— —— 345

Mr. *Souverain* underſtands the Paraphraſts to mean, by *Mimara*, the *Angel*, who bear the name of God —— —— ib.

They meaned a real Perſon. *Allix* and *Pearſon* quoted —— —— 349

Jerom ſays, the *Greek* Interpreters underſtood *El Shaddai* to mean the *Logos* —— ib.

Philo

Page

Philo ſuppoſed Him to be the *Angel*, who led the *Jews* out of *Egypt* —— —— 350
So does the Book of the Wiſdom of *Solomon* 352
And ſo does *Menahem* —— —— 353
And *Moſes Nachman* —— —— 357
And the *Cabaliſts* —— —— 359
And the *Sepher Ikkarim*, &c. as quoted by Biſhop *Pearſon* —— —— —— ib.
This Opinion agreeable to the New Teſtament, as interpreted by the *Chriſtian* Fathers; viz. *Irenæus*, *Clemens Alex.* *Tertullian*, *Origen* 361
Hippolitus, *Theophilus*, the Council of *Antioch* 363
Novatian, *Euſebius*, *Hilary*, *Ambroſe*, *Cyril*, *Juſtin Martyr* —— —— 365
The Council of *Sirmium* —— —— 369
How and when this Belief was loſt in the Church 371
The ſtate of the *Jewiſh* Faith at the ſame time ib.
But the ſame Doctrine revived with the revival of Letters —— —— 373
Chriſtian Commentators quoted in favour of it; *Allix*, *Bull*, *Poole*, *Pyle*; *Dutch* Annotators, *Calvin*, *Calovius*; *Ainſworth*, Archbiſhop *Teniſon* —— —— 374
Biſhop *Pearſon*, Biſhop *Bull*, Biſhop *Burnet*, Dr. *Samuel Clarke* —— —— 376
Dr. *Sykes*, Mr. *Lowth* —— —— 380
The *Jews* and *Mahometans* have been too raſh, in accuſing the *Chriſtians* of Idolatry —— 383
The Worſhip of *Chriſt* is of the ſame kind, as the Worſhip of the *Jehovah* Angel —— ib.
This opinion confirmed by the *Chriſtian* Fathers; viz. *Juſtin Martyr*, *Origen* —— 386
Cyprian, *Hippolytus*, Apoſtolic Conſtitutions, *Euſebius* —— —— 387
Tertullian, *Lactantius*, *Origen* —— —— 388
Baſil, *Novatian* —— —— 390

CONTENTS.

Page

Limborch and *Whitby* quoted, why *Chriſt* is called God —— —— 390

Remarks on the words of *Origen*, to prove the Father to be the *only true* God —— ib.

This Title never given to *Chriſt*, even by the Poſt-*Nicenes* —— —— 391

Two ſenſes to the word *God*, even among the *Athanaſians* —— —— ib.

Errors of the *Chriſtians* no objection to *Chriſtianity* ib.

The miſtakes of the *Chriſtians* owing to their confining the ſenſe of the word *God*, to the *ſelf-exiſtent* God —— —— 396

Sir *Iſaac Newton*'s opinion of the word *God* 397

The opinion of the *Heathens*. *Plato* quoted 399

The words *Elohim*, &c. in the Old Teſtament, how uſed. *Jehovah* the proper name of the *ſupreme* God —— —— 403

Jacob vows, that *Jehovah* ſhould be his *Elohim* 406

Chriſtians by no means Polytheiſts, who diſtinguiſh the words *Elohim* and *Jehovah*; and believe the Government of the world to be monarchical —— —— 407

Biſhop *Pearſon* ſuppoſes the pre-eminence of the Father —— —— 409

Chriſtians no Idolaters —— —— ib.

What is mean'd by Worſhip —— —— 410

What by Idolatry —— —— 413

The Worſhip of *Chriſt* is free from all the offenſive circumſtances, which condemn Idolatry ib.

However, *Chriſt* is never directly commanded to be prayed-to. We are directed to pray *through Him* —— —— 415

The opinion of *Origen*, with *Bull*'s obſervation on it —— —— 419

Concluſion; that all the affairs of Men, with regard to their Salvation have been carried-on by one Perſon —— —— 422

Poſt-

CONTENTS.

Page

POSTSCRIPT. The Philoſophical *Chriſtians* deny the *eſſential* Articles of *Chriſtianity* —— 424

1. The Deſcent of *Chriſt* from Heaven denied, by Dr. *South*, Dr. *Sherlock*, Biſhop *Fowler* 425

2. They deny the *Humiliation* of *Chriſt* —— 426

Biſhop *Bull*, Dr. *More*, Biſhop *Fowler* —— ib.

Dr. *More*'s Hypotheſis conſidered, of the pre-exiſtence of the human Soul —— 429

And Biſhop *Fowler*'s reaſoning upon it —— ib.

3. They deny the *Sufferings* of *Chriſt* —— 434

4. They deny the *Death* of *Chriſt* —— ib.

Why was it neceſſary to enter ſo far in this Argument —— —— —— 436

The Philoſophical *Chriſtians* not to be truſted but only the *Scriptures* —— —— 437

Extract from *Euſebius*' Eccleſ. Hiſt. —— ib.

CONTENTS

OF THE

FOURTH LETTER.

Page

THE Design of this Letter, to prove that *Jesus* was the *Messiah* —— —— 443

The *Messiah* foretold by the Prophets. *Maimonides* and the *Talmud*, and *Abravanel* quoted ib.

Josephus, *Tacitus*, and *Suetonius* quoted; to shew the Expectation of a *King*, who should reign over all —— —— 445

What *sacred Books* these Writers refer-to, examined 447

Josephus certainly mean'd the *Scriptures* —— 449

Not material to *Christianity*, whether this Prophesy was in the *Sybilline* Books, or no —— 453

A sufficient ground, from the Book of *Daniel*, to expect a King who should reign over all 459

The Book of *Daniel* defended. When and why it went out of Repute among the *Jews*. Attested-to by *Josephus* —— —— 460

The Prophesy in *Daniel*; and the mistake of *Josephus* accounted-for, in supposing *Vespasian* to be the Prince who should reign over all 462

Neither

Page

Neither *Philo* nor *Josephus* speak *freely* on the Subject —— —— 465

The Difficulties which arose to the ancient *Jews*, in understanding this Prophesy —— 466

And why we ought to listen to the way the *Christians* use to explain these Difficulties —— ib.

The Belief, that the *Messiah* was the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, answers four Objections *à priori*, to the *Christian* Faith —— — 469

1. The *Jehovah-Angel* is not supposed, in the *Christian* Scriptures, to be superseded in his Care over us by another Person —— ib.

2. The Law of *Moses* is not, in the *Christian* Scriptures, supposed to be abolished by a Person who had no *Authority* to do it —— 471

3. There is no absurdity in supposing, that a *new* Law was introduced by *Christ*; and confirmed by Miracles —— —— 475

4. *Christ* is not supposed by the *Christians* to be *another* Supreme *God*, but the *Son* of the *one* Supreme *God*: which was proved in Letter III. —— —— —— 478

And, the Objections *à priori* being removed, we can have no Excuse any longer for neglecting to examine into the Arguments used by the *Christians*, from our own Scriptures; in proof of the Fact, that the *Messiah* is already come —— —— 480

And, if we find a perfect Correspondence between the History of *Christ* in the *New Testament*, and the Prophesies of the *Messiah* in the *Old*; we must *admit* his Claim —— ib.

But we must not object to the *Christians* such Arguments, as will recoil upon our Selves, and our *own* Scriptures —— 482

The Correspondence between the History of *Christ* in the *New* Testament, and the Prophesies of

Page

of the *Meſſiah* in the *Old* Teſtament, examined by four *Criteria: viz.* his *Lineage*; the *Place* of his *Birth*; the *Time* of his *Advent*; and his *Actions* —— —— 484

A previous Objection of Mr. *Collins*, that no *Meſſiah* was foretold in the Old Teſtament plainly and literally —— —— 485

This Objection anſwered — —— 486

Mr. *Collins*'s Objection to the *Chaldee* Paraphraſes examined —— —— —— 492

1ſt Criterion, whether *Chriſt* anſwered to the Propheſies of the *Meſſiah*, in his *Lineage* 493

2d Criterion conſidered; *viz.* the *Place* of his *Birth* —— —— —— 498

3d Criterion conſidered; *viz.* the *Time* of his *Advent* —— —— 500

The Propheſy of *Haggai* ii. 7, 8, 9. conſidered ib.

And confirmed by *Malachi* iii. 1. —— 504

Mr. *Collins*'s Interpretation examined —— 506

The Propheſy of *Jacob* concerning *Shiloh* —— 509

Interpreted by Dr. *Hunt* —— —— 511

The ancient *Jews* leſs prejudiced, than the moderns —— —— 512

Daniel's Propheſy, chap. ii. conſidered —— ib.

The *ſeventy* Weeks explained, by Sir *Iſaac Newton* —— —— 513

The ancient *Jews* calculated, as the *Chriſtians* do 514

When the *Jews* began to interpret in a new way 521

4th. Criterion. The Miracles of *Chriſt* made the Criterion of his Miſſion; by *Chriſt*, *Celſus*, *Julian*, *Porphyry*, conſidered —— 523

Of Miracles by *Magic*. The Evidence of his Miracles not conteſted by his Enemies ib.

His *Kingdom* —— —— 528

Two States of *Meſſiah*; Afflicted and Exalted 532

Of his *Death* —— —— 533

The

CONTENTS.

	Page
The Unbelief of the modern *Jews* leſs excuſable than that of the ancients	534
The Expectation of his *firſt* appearance in the Clouds, not well founded	ib.
He muſt be *firſt* born of a *Woman*	536
And gain his *Kingdom* by *Sufferings*	ib.
Jews and *Chriſtians* differ about his *afflicted* State	537
We are not always certain, which *Advent* is ſpoken of	546
Sir *Iſaac Newton* quoted. The Propheſies of the *firſt* Advent few and obſcure, in compariſon with thoſe of his *ſecond* Advent	549
Chriſtians diſcard the literal Senſe of the Prophets wrongly	ib.
The literal and perſonal Theocracy of *Chriſt* over the *Chriſtians*	554
Jews and *Chriſtians* blame each other juſtly	557
Objections conſidered. Of two *Meſſiahs*	559
That he delayed his Coming	560
That we are ſaid to be ſaved in the days of *Meſſiah*	561
That he is concealed at *Rome*	ib.
The *Jews* refuſe the proper and ſufficient Proofs of the *Meſſiah*'s Miſſion; though the Truth of their own Religion is founded on the ſame Evidence of Propheſy and Miracles	563
The Rejection of *Chriſt* foretold by the Prophets; and ſo interpreted by the ancient *Jews*	566
A ſerious and pathetic Expoſtulation upon the preſent unhappy State of the *Jews*	ib.
Yet they ſhall be received again into favour	569
Events foretold in the *Chriſtian* Scriptures, as underſtood by the *Chriſtians*; which ſhall precede our Reſtoration	573
The Propheſy againſt *Rome*	576

Suppoſed

CONTENTS.

	Page
Suppoſed by ſome to include the *Proteſtant* Churches —— ——	577
Propheſy againſt the *Turkiſh* Empire ——	581
Our Scriptures declare, that *Elias* muſt firſt come	582
A *double* return of the *Jews* foretold ——	584
Our happy State deſcribed —— ——	587
Depends upon our Belief that *Jeſus* is the *Chriſt*	588
Internal Proofs of the *Chriſtian* Scriptures —	591
ADDENDUM. Obſervations on Profeſſor *Michaelis*'s Letter to Sir *John Pringle*, on the LXX Weeks of *Daniel* —— ——	593

N. B. I muſt warn my Reader in this place of a conſiderable miſtake in this Letter, occaſioned by not diſtinguiſhing the Kingdom of *Chriſt* over the *Jews* from his Kingdom over all, which is foretold by *Daniel* to commence upon his coming in the Clouds at the fall of the 4th Kingdom; and at the Sound of the 7th Trumpet, *Dan.* vii. 27. *Rev* xi. 15. Whatever therefore is ſaid of his Reign over all before that time, is ſaid upon the common miſtake, that Chriſt has already received the Kingdom promiſed.

LETTER THE FIRST.

Quo magis introſpicio, eo magis verum comperio; eos, qui περὶ τῆς τριάδος volunt ſupra τὰ ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς κείμενα ſapere, pœnas dare τῆς ἐνηλοφροσύνης. HUGO GROTIUS ad fratrem Gulielmum Epiſtola 152, p. 798.

YOU will not be ſurpriſed, my dear Friend, to hear; that I, who have paſſed through ſo many countries, and always fearleſsly engaged in religious diſputes with the inhabitants, ſhould ſtill continue my old practice: But to be informed, as I find you have been; that I am upon the point of giving-up, or perhaps that I have already given up, that religion in which I was educated, and which I have ſo long and ſo warmly defended; and joined with the Tritheiſts; may be an occaſion of much wonder to you: and indeed, if it were fact,

would be no leſs ſo to myſelf.——"Who could "imagine," you might ſay; "after our many "debates with the two Chriſtian prieſts at *Mar-* "*ſeilles*, upon the ſubject of the Unity, in de- "fenſe of *Khaled* the Mahometan; that you "ſhould be ſo ſoon reconciled to the doctrines, "you oppoſed ſo ſtrongly?"—Indeed, my good Friend, I am not ſo far gone as you ſuſpect; and would by no means have you believe me ſo unſettled in my principles, as common fame may report me to be; or ſo weak, as to have altered my opinion; with regard to thoſe eſſential points, which we then diſcourſed upon. The' God of *Iſrael* forbid, that I ſhould ever depart from the faith of our great Founder; and eſpecially, in that moſt fundamental of all principles, (which *Maimonides* calls *Fundamentum fundamentorum*;) in which we were ſo carefully and fully inſtructed by our worthy Tutor *Moſes Coſraim*; the Unity of *Jehovah*. No! there is nothing, I hope, in this world; that can move me from this belief: neither pain, nor poverty, nor death.

As to the Arguments, which were then uſed againſt us by the *Capucin* and *Jeſuit*; they neither made any impreſſion upon me at that time, nor ſince; but rather confirmed me more ſtrongly in the truth. For what did they attempt to prove, but merely the old ſtory, which they had ſo often objected to us; that the Father,

Son,

Son, and Holy Ghoſt, were each of them the ſupreme God; and yet were not *three* ſupreme Gods, but *one* and the *ſame* ſupreme God? Which, when it came to be explaned, appeared to be nothing more than the ancient Hereſy of *Sabellius*; that the three perſons in the Trinity were only three different Modes of Exiſtence, under which the one ſupreme God was ſuppoſed to act: which opinion, though it does by no means contradict our notion of the Unity of God; yet, as I then argued, and ſtill think, it entirely deſtroys the notion of a Trinity; by denying the perſonal, that is, the actual, exiſtence both of the Son and Spirit. For a Trinity of Perſons can no more be conſtituted, by the Father's acting under the three different characters of Father, Son, and Spirit; than by acting under the three different characters of Creator, Preſerver, and Benefactor. And this it was that gave me the firſt ſuſpicion, that the Chriſtians were not Polytheiſts; as they had always been repreſented to me: for I thought it impoſſible, that they ſhould believe the exiſtence of Three Gods; and yet give up the Perſonality, that is, the *perſonal exiſtence*, of their Founder and Redeemer; rather than admit of Two.

It is this opinion, *viz.* That the Chriſtians believe a Trinity of Gods, and thereby maintain a doctrine contrary to the Unity of *Jehovah*;

which hath ſo long prevented the ſons of *Iſhmael*, as well as of *Iſrael*, from examining with any patience into their religious principles. *Mahomet* ſays, "it is a long time ſince the Infidels "have ſaid there are three Gods; certainly there "is but One (*a*)." And when *Jacob Ben-Sidi Aali* is giving an account of the *Mahometan* doctrines as reveled by the angel *Gabriel*, he ſays, "they "are to believe in One God, to whom *no other* "*is equal*: and this latter clauſe is added di-"rectly in oppoſition to the Chriſtians; who "believe there are *three Perſons* in God *equal* "to one another (*b*)." And the Jews explane the ſecond article of *Sephir Ikkarim* (*c*), to pull down the chriſtians faith in the *Trinity*, maintaining it to be the aſſertion of a *Triple Godhead* (*d*). "And both *Jews* and *Moors* accord in "exploding it as a hypocondriacal imagination "of the chriſtians; whom they accuſe of *Poly-*"*theiſm* out of an ignorant conceit that the "chriſtians imagine every *Perſon* of the bleſſed "*Trinity* to be a *diſtinct* Deity (*e*)." So that if the perſuaſion that the Meſſiah was to be a *temporal* Prince, did (as the chriſtians ſay) prevent our Fathers from believing in him at his firſt appearance; the current opinion at preſent, that the Chriſtian religion ſuppoſes him to be a

(*a*) Koran ch. V. (*b*) Urbes & Mores Orient. (*c*) See Note I. (*d*) Dr. L. Addiſon's State of the Jews, p. 17, 18. (*e*) Ibid. p. 26, ſee Note II.

ſupreme

ſupreme ſelf-exiſting God, *perſonally diſtinct* and *different* from the Lord *Jehovah*, which is a direct contradiction to the whole Revelation given to our Fathers; is as great an obſtacle to *our* believing in him *now:* and has for many ages prevented Chriſtianity from making any farther progreſs in the world.

I own to you, when I firſt looked into the Chriſtian writings at *Liſbon*; it was without the leſt expectation of meeting with any truth, that could be of ſervice to me: it was rather from a deſire of knowing, upon what principles their ſtrange opinion of three Gods was founded; that I might be able more effectually to hold-up an argument againſt them, and defend the Unity of *Jehovah*. But the caſe was much altered, when I came to talk with the *Engliſh* Proteſtants; whom I found to be much more free and generous in their way of thinking, than any other Chriſtians I had ever converſed with: and, except in the ſingle article of the Unity, not only very ready to hear reaſon; but to anſwer it alſo in a rational manner. This candid behaviour gave me a better opinion of Chriſtianity in general, than I ever had before; and drew me on by degrees to conſider its doctrines, and particularly their doctrine of the Trinity, more minutely and accurately, than I at firſt apprehended to be neceſſary: for I could not think, that any people would ſuffer their

reli-

religion to be fairly examined into by Reaſon; if it had not ſomething plauſible in it at leſt, if not defenſible: and my curioſity was raiſed the higher; becauſe I had never heard any thing of it before, but what was mere bigotry and contradiction.

Now as the grand point I have always had in view to inculcate, is the Unity of *Jehovah*; and upon this ſubject the people in *England* ſeemed to have very vague and uncertain notions; and very few of them appeared capable of giving me any plain and intelligible account of it; and thoſe, who were capable, were not willing to do it: I was at length reſolved to ſee, what their New Teſtament ſaid about it. And I was the more inclined to enter upon this ſtudy; becauſe I found it neceſſary for my health, to draw-off my thoughts from my misfortunes in the Earthquake; and find-out ſome amuſing employment for the many leiſure hours, which, ſince my receſs from buſineſs, began to lie heavy on my hands.

I have therefore ſeveral times read-over that very extraordinary book; which, even at the firſt reading, ſeemed to throw an amazing light upon our prophecies; and to ſolve me many difficulties. But what moſt ſurpriſed me was, that I met with no appearance of Polytheiſm through the whole; except merely ſome figurative expreſſions, which manifeſtly ought to be

other-

otherwiſe interpreted; and, at the ſame time, as ſtrong aſſertions of the *Unity*, as any in our own Scripture; and ſuch a wonderful difference of doctrines, in numberleſs points, from what I expected; that I much queſtion, whether genuine Chriſtianity hath been more falſely repreſented by its open enemies, or its profeſſed friends. And if I were to receive no other improvement from my labour than this; I ſhould at leſt learn to be more cautious for the future, how I indulge a prejudice againſt any ſet of people whatſoever; without firſt examining their ſentiments fairly, whether they actually profeſs the errors they are charged with by their adverſaries or no; and obſerve more carefully that excellent maxim, which you tell me is inſcribed upon the *Stadthouſe* at *Amſterdam*; AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM. In ſhort, the Chriſtianity I have met with among the Proteſtants in *England*, and in the New Teſtament, is as different from the Chriſtianity we found in *France* and *Portugal*; as Light from Darkneſs.

Now, if the Chriſtians themſelves have ſo ſtrangely miſrepreſented the doctrines of the New Teſtament by their *Traditions*; how can we wonder, if our own *Rabbins* have given us, in their way, as imperfect and falſe an account of them? or that We, who are bred-up in prejudices againſt the Chriſtians from our youth, ſhould believe them to be Polytheiſts; merely

becauſe

becauſe we are told ſo? For we are afraid to ſee with our own eyes, or hear with our own ears; and implicitly believe all that the Maſters teach us: And, while the world is growing wiſer in other things, and we improve upon our anceſtors in every art and ſcience; we have wilfully ſhut our eyes againſt all farther knowledge in *divine* truths, which are of the greateſt importance to us; and refuſe to receive them, though reveled by God himſelf; unleſs they be alſo derived unto us, or confirmed by the authority of a *Rabbin* or a *Sanhedrim*; and oftentimes in a very different ſenſe from that in which God reveled them: For who is there, among us all, that adheres to the Scripture alone, without the addition of *Talmud* traditions, and the interpretations of the Maſters (*f*)?

I don't mention this, as a weakneſs peculiar to *our* nation; but rather as a general infatuation, and the greateſt obſtacle to Truth that can be imagined: For what can be more amazing, than to find the revelations of God ſo mixed and confounded with the inventions of Men; that nothing is more difficult than to ſeparate them? And this is not only the caſe with real revelations; but even pretended ones: The *Sonna*, or book of traditions, among the Mahometans, being looked upon, by many of them, to be of equal authority with the *Koran*

(*f*) Note III.

itſelf,

itſelf, and conſidered as a teſt of Orthodoxy; as the Talmud is with Us; the Council of *Trent* with the Romaniſts, and ſeveral Catechiſms, Confeſſions of Faith, Articles of Religion, and ſuch like human compoſitions, among the Proteſtants. For no ſooner are the learned Divines ſatisfied, that the revelation comes from God; than they all agree to ſubſtitute ſome human compoſition in the ſtead of it: and when their Catechumens "aſk for an Egg, they give them "a Scorpion; they aſk for Bread, and they re-"ceive a Stone."

What the learned Dr. *Cudworth* complains-of in the Chriſtians, is equally true, *mutatis mutandis*, of all Mankind: "Do we not open "and lock-up heaven now-a-days, with the "private key of this or that opinion of our ſe-"veral fanſies, as we pleaſe? and, if any ob-"ſerve Chriſt's commandments never ſo ſin-"cerely, and ſerve God with faith and a pure "conſcience, that yet haply ſkills not of ſome "contended-for opinions, ſome darling no-"tions; he hath not the right *Shibboleth*, he "hath not the true Watch-word; he muſt not "paſs the guards of Heaven (*g*)." Thus We alſo extract our *Shibboleth* from the opinions of our favourite Doctors; by which the true Faith is to be tried and approved: We then go on farther, to examine and interpret the word of

(*g*) Cudworth's Sermon on 1 John ii. 34.

God by *their* Authority; and make the Scripture itſelf bend and bow to it; and admit no doctrine, how plainly ſoever reveled, which contradicts it: and thus erect a Serpent for our adoration; which, though at firſt intended to ſerve good purpoſes, does at length lead us into Impiety. So certain it is; that nothing but divine truth can, for any length of time, ſupport divine truth. The moment we give way to *human* Authority, in the interpretation of Scripture; there is an end of all *divine* Faith: and we found our religion upon the opinions of weak and fallible men (*b*)." And then all religions are ſo far upon an equal footing.

After this free and ingenuous confeſſion, you will probably aſk me; Whether I imagine our notion of Polytheiſm among the Chriſtians hath no foundation at all? and, if ſo; from whence had our Maſters this opinion? and how came the Mahometans to agree with them, that it is the fundamental error of Chriſtianity; and to declare the *Unity* of God to be the *chief*, or rather the *only* cauſe of *Mahomet*'s miſſion? The Chriſtians, ſays he, have fallen into Errors, corrupting this dogma of the *Unity* by the doctrine of the *Trinity*; and God, who would not leave the eſſential truths without Teſtimony, ſent his Prophet *(Mahomet)* to re-eſtabliſh

(*b*) Taylor's Liberty of proph. Sect. 1. 12.

them

them (*i*). I anſwer; the opinion did not take its riſe from the genuine doctrines of Chriſtianity: but from the diſputes among the Chriſtians, many centuries ago; and the unmanly heat and obloquy, with which they reflected upon one another.

And yet I think it is but juſtice to own; that their differences and diſputes did not procede at firſt from any bad cauſe, but from a very laudable one; from a zelous attachment to what they looked upon to be the *true faith*; while they were at a loſs to know what *that* was, from the want of a criterion to aſcertain and determine, when the words of Scripture ought to be underſtood in a *literal*, and when in a *figurative* ſenſe; when in a *more reſtrained*, and when in an *abſolute* one; and each party imagined the honour of God would be beſt promoted, and the Chriſtian religion beſt vindicated, by interpreting the doubtful texts according to their particular ſyſtems.

This uncertainty affects the hiſtory of the Fall of Man, the Sacrifice of Chriſt, the Euchariſt, the Millennium, the Locality of Hell, and the Nature of its Fire, the Generation of the Son of God, and many other ſubjects; but that which cauſed the greateſt diviſions and animoſities in the Chriſtian church, was the controverſy about the Trinity; under the two

(*i*) *Reland*'s Four treatiſes, p. 172.

famous heretics of *Alexandria*, *Arius* and *Athanaſius*; I call them both Heretics, becauſe they were both condemned by the Councils. And it was this diſpute that gave riſe to the prevaling opinion I am now ſpeaking of, both among us and the Mahometans; that the Chriſtians in general are Polytheiſts and Idolaters. This accuſation was firſt begun by the Chriſtians themſelves; by way of excuſe for the dreadful perſecutions they exerciſed againſt one another: which were followed, according to the juſt judgement of God, by the ruin of the Chriſtian churches in *Aſia*; and the introduction of Mahometiſm.

" If we look into the eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians, " even from the third century; we ſhall find " the Chriſtian world to have then had a very " different aſpect from what ſome authors have " repreſented: and ſo far from being endued " with active graces, zeal, and devotion, and " eſtabliſhed within itſelf with purity of doc- " trine, union, and firm profeſſion of faith; " that, on the contrary, by the ambition of " the Clergy, &c. they loſt the whole ſub- " ſtance of their religion (*k*)."

Dr. *Prideaux*, ſpeaking of theſe diſturbances, ſays of the Chriſtians: " Having drawn the ab- " ſtruſeſt niceties into controverſy, they did " thereby ſo deſtroy peace, love, and charity,

(*k*) Sale's Koran, 33.

" among

" among them; that they loſt the whole ſub-
" ſtance of their religion; and in a manner
" drove Chriſtianity quite out of the world;
" So that the *Saracens*, taking advantage of
" the weakneſs of power, and the diſtractions
" of councils, which theſe diviſions had cauſed;
" ſoon over-ran with a terrible devaſtation all
" the Eaſtern provinces of the Roman empire,
" turned every where their Churches into
" Moſques, and their worſhip into a horrid ſu-
" perſtition; and forced on them that abomina-
" ble impoſture of *Mahometiſm* (*l*)."——" The
" unhappy Conteſts, which in the fifth century
" divided the churches, particularly in the Eaſt;
" occaſioned damages, which Chriſtianity will
" never be able to recover. Theſe ſects," *viz.* of the *Neſtorians* and *Eutychians*; " partly
" from idleneſs and ſuperſtition, and partly
" from the particular grudge, envy, and ma-
" lice, of the eccleſiaſtics, gave the finiſhing
" ſtroke to mutual forbearance in matters of
" religion. From that time there was nothing
" to be ſeen in the Eaſt, but proſcriptions,
" maſſacres, and rage (*m*)."

Etherius (*n*), a biſhop of the fifth century, who was perſecuted for *Neſtorianiſm*, ſays; " I paſs
" over in ſilence the chains, the priſons, the

(*l*) Prideaux's Life of Mahomet. (*m*) Reland's Four Treatiſes, p. 165 to 169. Letter VIII. p. 52. (*n*) *Etherius Tyanorum epiſcopus, inter opera Theodoreti*, Tom. v. p. 688.

" con-

" confiſcations, the marks of infamy, the maſ-
" ſacres that call for compaſſion: the enormity
" of which is ſuch; that even thoſe, who had
" the misfortune to be witneſſes of them, are
" ſcarce able to believe them to be true. All
" theſe tragedies are matters of ſport to the
" Biſhops; among whom want of bowels paſſes
" for courage: they call their cruelty, zeal;
" and they honour their cheats and impoſtures
" with the name of wiſdom. In this unhappy
" age, monaſteries endured ſieges; they came
" to blows in councils; they entered into
" the churches with arms; they treated with
" the utmoſt cruelty all thoſe, that were ſuſ-
" pected of favouring opinions which ſcarce
" any body underſtood (*o*): not even thoſe, who
" defended them with the greateſt obſtinacy
" and ſtiffneſs (*p*)." And their conteſts for pre-
ferment were carried to ſuch a height at *Rome*, for the Epiſcopal ſeat, by *Damaſus* and *Urſicinus*; that there were no leſs than 137 killed in one day (*q*). It was on account of theſe diviſions and cruelties, which tore the church to pieces, that *Grotius* ſays; *Qui legit*, &c. He that reads eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, what does he meet with but the vices of the Biſhops (*r*)? And *Ammianus Marcellinus* ſays, No wild Beaſts are ſo furious

(*o*) Note IV. (*p*) Reland's Four Treatiſes, 165.
(*q*) Sale's Koran, 33, 34. (*r*) Ep. 22, p. 1.

againſt

againſt Men, as Chriſtians are againſt one another: " *Nullas infeſtas hominibus beſtias, ut ſunt* " *ſibi ferales expertus* (*s*)." An inſtance or two of the fury and barbarity of thoſe times will give a better notion of them, than to deal in generals.

The firſt ſhall be that of *Hypatia*, in the fifth century. " She was a woman ſo famous for " Learning, that ſhe excelled in all Philoſo- " phy; and taught in the ſchools (which *Plo-* " *tinus* continued:) ſo that ſhe had ſcholars " out of many countries, and was oft with " princes and rulers, and for her Modeſty and " Gravity was much eſteemed. *Oreſtes*, the " governor, often talking with her, the peo- " ple ſaid; it was by Her means that He was " not reconciled to *Cyril*. They laid hold of " her, drew her into a church, ſtripped her " ſtark naked, raſed the ſkin, and tore the " fleſh off her body with ſharp ſhells, till ſhe " died. They quarter'd her body, and burn'd " her to aſhes (*t*)."

The other inſtance ſhall be of *Proterius*, biſhop of *Alexandria*; " who, flying from the " people's rage, got into the Baptiſtery, a " place reverenced by the barbarians and the " fierceſt men; but theſe furious people, ſet- " on by their biſhop *Timothy*, (whom they had

(*s*) Lib. 22. (*t*) Baxter's Church Hiſtory, p. 85. Soc. VII. 15.

" choſen)

" choſen) neither reverencing the place, the " worſhip, the time, (which was *Eaſter*;) nor " the office of prieſthood, did ſtrike the blame- " leſs man, and kill him cruelly, with ſix " more; and dragging his wounded carcaſe " every where, and cruelly drawing it about " through almoſt all the parts of the city, did " mercileſsly beat the ſenſeleſs corpſe, and di- " vided his parts, and ſpared not to tear his " entrails with their teeth, like dogs; and, " caſting the reſt of his body into the fire, they " ſcattered his aſhes into the wind; tranſcend- " ing the fierceneſs of all beaſts: and the archi- " tect of this was [their new biſhop] *Timothy*(*u*)."

In this ſtate of confuſion and madneſs among the Chriſtians, *Arabia* became a ſecure retreat for thoſe who were proſcribed; and was peopled at the expenſe of the *Greek* Empire.

" It is certain, from Chriſtian and *Arabian* " authors; that, before the Preaching of *Ma-* " *homet*, the Chriſtian religion was known in " *Arabia*; ſeveral Tribes having embraced it. " The *Neſtorians*, on one ſide, whoſe Commu- " nion extended formerly all the way to *China*, " through the northern provinces of *Aſia*; and " the followers of *Eutychius* and *Dioſcurus*, " ſpreading themſelves in *Egypt*, *Armenia*, and " *Meſopotamia*, brought over the whole king-

(*u*) See Binnius, 147, 151.—Baxter, 110. Euag. L. II. c. VIII. Niceph. L. XIV. c. XVI. or XVII.

" dom

" dom of the *Abyſſines*; and the whole kingdom " of the *Homerites*, in the ſouth of *Arabia*, had " embraced it. Nevertheleſs, in a ſhort time, " we ſaw all theſe unhappy nations embrace " Mahometiſm. To what can we attribute " ſo rapid and general a revolution, and ſuch " ſucceſs to an impoſture; but to the Scandal " occaſioned by the fatal diviſions of Chriſtians, " and the proſcriptions and maſſacres practiſed " upon one another(*x*)?"

The direct anſwer therefore to the queſtion, How it came to paſs; that the Chriſtians have ſtill been looked upon, by Us and the Mahometans, as Polytheiſts and idolaters; is this: that it came from their own intemperate zole, in perſecuting one another under ſuch denominations; whilſt, in the true diabolical ſpirit of controverſy, each ſect among them drew what *inferences* it pleaſed from the doctrines of its adverſaries; and then fixed thoſe inferences upon Them, as the *opinions* and *doctrines* which they taught. Thus Archbiſhop *Teniſon* tells us, with regard to *Arius*; " *Arius*, the *Libyan*, a prieſt " of *Alexandria*, is accuſed by the Fathers both " as a Heretic and an Idolater; and his idolatry " is charged upon him as the juſt conſequence " of his heretical opinion(*y*)." So that it was from theſe *ſuppoſed Conſequences*, and not from

(*x*) Reland, p. 165 to 169. (*y*) Teniſon on Idolatry, p. 158.

any of the *direct and avowed* Doctrines which any one ſect among the Chriſtians ever owned, and maintained; that they accuſed one another of that Idolatry and Polytheiſm, which they all equally diſclamed, and looked upon to be the greateſt calumny and injuſtice to be charged with: the natural conſequence of which, moſt juſtly returned upon themſelves; in that their enemies very readily received their teſtimony againſt one another, and believed every thing that was bad againſt them all in general.

But an impartial man, who is not biaſſed by the prejudices of former times, and is willing to give every man leave to declare and explane his own ſentiments; cannot eaſily believe ſuch an accuſation: On the contrary he will plainly ſee, that the various interpretations of the texts relating to this ſubject, and the ſeveral hereſies that have been introduced about it, had all of them this one point in view; how to *avoid* thoſe very doctrines, of which they are accuſed: and accordingly it is confeſſed by *Irenæus*, concerning moſt of them; "that the maintainers "of them do acknowledge one God: however "their notions of him might be corrupted(z)." And it was merely becauſe they could not receive ſo impious a doctrine, as the ſufferings and death of the inviſible *Jehovah*, the God of the univerſe, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς, the ſupreme, ſelf-

(z) Irenæus, l. 1, c. 19. pa. 114.

exiſtent

exiſtent God; that ſo many extravagant opinions have been invented to evade it.

The *Baſilidians*, in the very beginning of Chriſtianity, denied that Chriſt himſelf ſuffered; but ſaid, *Simon* the *Cyrenian* ſuffered in his place (*a*); and the *Cerinthians* before them, and the *Carpocratians* next, (to name no more of thoſe who affirmed *Jeſus* to have been a mere man;) did believe the ſame thing. *Photius* quotes, from a book called the Journeys of the Apoſtles; that He was not crucified, but another in his ſtead. —Some thought it was a ſpy, who came to intrap him; others, that it was *Titian*, who was directed by *Judas* to kill him; and in the forged Epiſtle of *Barnabas*, it is ſaid to have been *Judas* himſelf, who appeared like him: and others ſay, that his Manhood only ſuffered; and that his Godhead aſcended into Heaven(*b*). The laſt of theſe notions is pretty much the ſame with that which is now held by many, though differently expreſſed; *viz.* that Chriſt ſuffered only in his Human nature; the Divine nature being impaſſible.

Thus the Divinity of Chriſt was given-up by ſome; and his Sufferings and Death by others. Chriſt was divided into *two* Chriſts; and the Chriſt that ſuffered, ſuppoſed to be different from the Chriſt that came down from Heaven; though the New Teſtament never ſpeaks of more

(*a*) Ibid. l. 1. cap. 23. Epiph. Hær. 24. numb. 3.
(*b*) Sale's Koran, p. 42 and 79.

than one. But, notwithſtanding ſuch differences, there is not the leſt pretence to ſay, as the Chriſtians in power generally do upon ſuch occaſions; that any of theſe opinions were taken up, out of a vain deſire of appearing ſingular; or retained, out of an obſtinacy of temper; for, in truth, they were forced into them becauſe they could ſee no other way to reconcile Scripture with Scripture; preſerve, as they thought, the honour of Chriſt; and maintain, at all events, the grand point they *all* had in view; to wit, the Honour and Dignity of the one God: for, how inconſiſtent ſoever they have been in other matters, none of them have ever given-up this; but unanimouſly profeſſed, "That the Lord our "God is ONE; the origin, the cauſe, the author, "the root, the fountain, the head, of the Son, "and the whole Divinity; according to the nu-"merous teſtimonies of the ancient doctors of "the church(*c*)."

But if theſe warm antagoniſts have been actually *guilty* of the Idolatry and Polytheiſm they imputed to each other; ſurely we have no right to condemn Chriſtianity itſelf, upon that account; unleſs we can ſhew, that It *favours* ſuch opinions and practices.——Some affirm of Chriſt, that he was created, and (*d*) there was a time, (or duration), when he was not; Others, that

(*c*) Pearſon on the Creed, pa. 37, 38. Lond. 1741.
(*d*) Note V.

he,

he exiſted from Eternity(*e*).—Some ſay, that he was begotten of the Father by a *Neceſſity* of *Nature*; Others anathematiſe them for that opinion, and declare, that he was begotten by the *Will* of the *Father*.—Some aſſert, that he was not a Son, till he was begotten of the Virgin *Mary*; Others, that he was begotten twice before the Creation, and a third time at his Incarnation(*f*); Others, that he is eternally generating and generated; as Light from the Sun.—Some believe, he continued to be the identical and numerical ſubſtance of the Father, after he was begotten; and Others, that the words υἱὸς γεννηθείς, and ἐκ πατρὸς, imply a disjunction from the Father's ſubſtance; and a ſeparate exiſtence *per ſe*.—In theſe, and a thouſand other metaphyſical difficulties, the Chriſtians have involved themſelves; by deſerting the expreſs words of Scripture, and puſhing their own interpretations farther than God has reveled; and by reſtraining the word of God from its primitive latitude, in which Chriſt and the Apoſtles left it, have formed particular ſects and parties in religion, and made diviſions in the church, according to theſe human and uncertain interpretations; and anathematiſed all ſuch, as would not ſubmit to them. But, whatever has been the doctrine of *particular* churches, in conſequence of this

(*e*) Note VI. (*f*) Note VII. See Bulli Op. p. 100, Domino Noſtro, &c.

" profane

"profane and sacrilegious impiety;" the *universal* church of Christ allows of no such mixture of divine and human placits; being open to all that believe the Scriptures: and a man may be a good Christian, and a member of the Church of Christ; who has never been admitted into any particular visible church at all, nor ever examined into the metaphysical nature of the divine substance. The truth of Christianity is therefore by no means concerned in the solution of these, or any other such like questions: on the contrary, it is from such curious and unprofitable enquiries into the metaphysical nature of the Son of God, that the chief difficulties in Christianity have arisen: so that most of the Christians I have met with, are at a loss to inform me in the very first principle of their religion; who the person really is, whom they call by the name of Christ, and sometimes declare to have suffered for mankind, and, at other times, to be impassible; i. e. incapable of suffering.

It is upon account of this fundamental article, *viz.* that the *Messiah* suffered according to the Scriptures; which seems to be contradicted by the Christian Philosophers, in supposing him incapable of suffering; that I find myself obliged in this Apology to enter into such kind of disputes, with regard to which the New Testament is silent. Because, if the Christians

have

have actually proved, or are able to prove, that Chriſt was incapable of ſuffering; it muſt neceſſarily follow, that he did *not ſuffer*; and if he did not ſuffer, he was not the *Meſſiah*, foretold by *Iſaiah* and *Daniel*; and if he did not anſwer to the deſcription of the *Meſſiah*, which is given by our Prophets; he was not the *Meſſiah* we expected.

And yet the Chriſtians tell us; (and our own Scriptures, as well as theirs, ſeem to authoriſe their aſſertion;) that our Diſperſion will certainly continue, till we become one with them; and receive their *Meſſiah* as *our King*, who is to reign over all.—And, if this be the caſe, when ſhall we ſee the end of our miſeries? Muſt We ſtay, till the Chriſtians are ſo enlightened as to be all of one mind, and teach us the ſame rational and conſiſtent doctrines? Or ſhall we kindly lend them our aſſiſtance; and from the ſtyle and language, and ſenſe of *our* Scriptures, which they allow to be of divine authority, endeavour to explane to them the true ſenſe and meaning of *their own?* This would certainly be a more acceptable labour to them, then they have received from their own brethren of late years; who have been employed for ſome time in pulling down the errors that were built up in the days of darkneſs and ignorance, and removing the old rubbiſh; but have hitherto erected nothing themſelves ſubſtantial in the ſtead: which has

has frequently prevented the Chriſtians in general from diſtinguiſhing their Friends from their Enemies.

The firſt thing therefore, which I ſhall undertake to do in theſe papers, (wherein I mean to lay before you an apology for my preſent ſentiments,) ſhall be to conſider; who the perſon is whom the Chriſtians call by the name of Chriſt.

Secondly, To ſhew; upon what grounds I am convinced that *Jeſus Chriſt* is the *Meſſiah*, that was promiſed to the Jews; and,

Thirdly, To explane the Chriſtian doctrine of Redemption and Salvation by Chriſt; agreeably to the Old and New Teſtament, the nature and attributes of God, and the common notions and principles of Mankind.

And when I have informed you what my notions are, and by what reaſons I ſupport them; I doubt not but you will either agree with me, that our Prophecies are completed; or point out my Errors to me with a friendly hand. Which ever be the event, I have no other end in this Inquiry; than to underſtand in the true ſenſe what God has been pleaſed to revele to us.

The firſt thing which I ſhall undertake to conſider is this: Who the perſon is, whom the Chriſtians call by the name of *Chriſt*; and under this head I ſhall briefly lay before you the chief of thoſe many different hypotheſes, which have been invented by ingenious men among the

the Chriſtians; in order to account for the Perſon, Actions, and Character of Chriſt: and particularly how he can be ſaid to have ſuffered *Death*, conſiſtently with his being called by the name of *God*; and how he can be *God*, conſiſtently with the *Unity* of the inviſible *Jehovah*.

To ſolve theſe difficulties, the Chriſtians have taken different ways: ſome have ſuppoſed Chriſt to be a mere *Man*; ſome, that he is the *ſelf-exiſtent Jehovah*; ſome that he is *Both*; and ſome that he is *Neither*: and all theſe, though aiming at the ſame general end and deſign, *viz.* the honour of God, and the propagation of Chriſtianity; yet, becauſe they do not explane their difficulties in the ſame way, look upon one another as Heretics and Enemies to God and Man; and can never ſpeak of one another without abuſive language.

Thoſe whoſe opinions appear moſt oppoſite to one another, are the *Sabellians* and *Socinians*. The reſt have formed different ſyſtems, as well as they could in order to avoid theſe two extremes; and it is obſervable, that all the capital Hereſies, which have ariſen in the Church, ſeem to be nothing more than ſuch Conſequences, as pious, honeſt, and ingenious men, might naturally enough have drawn and concluded upon, from the opinions of the orthodox.

And firſt; It was very natural for the *Sabellians* to argue from theſe orthodox principles,

[*viz.* that the Son was of the ſame ſubſtance with the Father, and had all the divine Attributes; and that they were not (δύο πράγματα) *two things*; and that there is only *one* God, and Chriſt is the *ſame one* God with the Father;] to the concluſion, which peculiariſed their ſect; that the Father and Son muſt be *one* and the *ſame* under different names or characters.—This hereſy was held in the Weſt by the *Patripaſſians*, and in the Eaſt by the *Sabellians*, under *Hermogenes*, *Praxeas*, *Noetus*, *Victorinus*, &c. *Noetus* being queſtioned about it, anſwered; Τί γὰρ κακὸν πεποίηκα; ἕνα Θεὸν δοξάζω, ἕνα ἐπίσαμαι· καὶ οὐκ ἄλλον πλὴν ἀυτὸν γεννηθέντα, πεποιθότα, ἀποθανόντα; "What evil have I "done? I glorify one God, I believe one God, "and that no other was born, ſuffered, and "died, except him(*g*)." They believed one ſingular and individual ſubſtance with three perſonal denominations, μίαν ὑπόστασιν τριπρόσωπον, or, ἓν τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ(*h*). Dr. *Cudworth* ſays; they believed but one "Hypoſtaſis or ſingular individual Eſ-"ſence of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt; "and conſequently, that they were but three "ſeveral Names, or Notions, or Modes, of one "and the ſelf ſame thing(*i*)." And here they agree with the nominal *Trinitarians*; and moſt of the reformed Churches.

(*g*) *Pearſon*, 158. (*h*) Reply to Dr. Waterland's Defence of his Queries, p. 472. (*i*) *Cudworth*, 605.

Dupin

Dupin indeed ſays of *Praxeas*; that he acknowledged but one *Perſon* in God, not diſtinguiſhing the Father from the Son; and conſequently maintained, that the *Father* was made Man, and ſuffered for us (*k*): and *Theodoret* (*l*) may perhaps ſeem to agree with Him; for, ſpeaking of the *Montaniſts*, he ſays; ſome of them with *Sabellius* denied the three Perſons in the Godhead, and ſaid the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt were τὸν ἀυτὸν, the ſame Perſon (*m*). But theſe notions, *viz.* that the *three Perſons* are the ſame *one Perſon*, and that the *Father* ſuffered; were not expreſsly held by the *Sabellians*: but drawn as conſequences from their doctrines by their adverſaries. For we are told by *Baſil*; that it was not unity of *Perſon*, but unity of *Eſſence*, which was objected to them; which was probably the ſame *homoouſian* doctrine, that was once maintained by *Paulus Samoſatenus*; and is now held by the nominal *Trinitarians*, and eſtabliſhed by the *Lateran* Council:—For *Baſil*, as quoted by *Sandius*, ſays, it is *Sabellianiſm* to confeſs one Subſtance (that, is one *numerical* Subſtance) of three Perſons; *unam trium Perſonarum ſubſtantiam vel rem* (*n*): ſo ſays *Greg. Nazianzen* (*o*) and *Victor Africanus* (*p*). For Sabellius thought the Subſtance of the Father was *ſubſtantia ſolida*, ὐσία

(*k*) Dupin, Nov. Bib. p. 98. (*l*) Burnet's Animadverſions on Mr. Hill's Book, p. 6. (*m*) Bulli Op. p. 36. (*n*) Epiſ. 64. 391. 349. (*o*) Or. 21. (*p*) 1 Cont. Ar.

and *hypoſtaſis*; but the Son and Holy Ghoſt to be only ἐνεργείαι, comparing the Father to the Subſtance of the Sun, the Son to the Illumination or Ray, and the Holy Ghoſt to its Heat—giving Eſſence to the Father, Knowledge to the Son, and Life to the Holy Ghoſt. *Epiphanius* ſays; in the one Subſtance of the Deity, *Sabellius* puts three Names; as in Man are reckoned Body, Soul, and Spirit. From whence it appears; that what is ſaid of *Sabellius*, "that he "believed the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, "to be the ſame;" is not to be underſtood, as if the Father was the Son, and the Son the Spirit: but that the ſame one God is Father, Son, and Spirit; as one Man is Body, Soul, and Spirit: and ſo *Epiphanius* explains it(*q*). "So that the Eſſence of *Sabellianiſm*, and the "doctrine of *Paulus Samoſatenus*, evidently de-"ſtroyed the real exiſtence of the Perſon of "the Son;" making all the Perſons to be ταυτοούσιοι(*r*), one and the ſame identical exiſting Being: [ἓν πρᾶγμα]. In oppoſition to which opinion, *Origen* and *Euſebius* "aſſert; that the "Son, or Word, is not the one ſupreme God "over all: that being the notion, for which "*Sabellius* was excommunicated(*s*);" and it is the preſent opinion of the *Pſeudoathanaſians:* and indeed, as to the main queſtion, who it was

(*q*) Hær. 62. pa. 513. See Sandii Nuc. 179. (*r*) Note VIII. (*s*) Reply to Waterland's Defence, 460.

that

that ſuffered and died for mankind; it is not eaſy to ſee, wherein the *Sabellians* and *Pſeudoathanaſians* differ: ſince they both agree, that the Son was ſupreme God. But both of them have their Evaſions. The *Sabellians*, though they confeſs the Son to be *homoouſious* with the Father, and the ſame numerical Eſſence; yet, in order to avoid this conſequence, that the Trinity was born of the Virgin *Mary* and ſuffered, which ſeems to follow from their doctrine; declare, that Chriſt was a mere Man(*t*). Dr. *Cave* ſays the ſame of *Paulus Samoſatenus*; *Artemonis hæreſin inſtauravit, Chriſtum Dei Verbum ſubſiſtentiam a Patre diſtinctam habere negans, ipſum tamen in terras deſcendentem nudum hominem fuiſſe, ante* Mariam *non exſtitiſſe, & nomen Filii Dei non niſi bonis operibus meruiſſe*(*u*). Or, in other words, *alium eſſe Deum Verbum, alium Chriſtum*(*x*): by which notion they ſeem to agree with the *Cerinthians*; making the Word of God a different Perſon from Chriſt.

The *Pſeudoathanaſians*, in order to avoid the ſame difficulty, tell us, that it was not the Father, (whom they allow to be the ſupreme God,) that ſuffered; but the Son, (whom they declare to be the *ſame ſupreme God*, but yet a different *Perſon*;) who ſuffered only in the Human nature; the Divinity being impaſſible.

(*t*) Sandii Nucleus, 188. (*u*) Hiſt. Lit. 98.
(*x*) Sandii Nuc. 191.

Thus

Thus *they* alſo *divide* Chriſt: and fall into the ſame hereſy. But more of this hereafter.

Now as it is impoſſible, that the Supreme God of the Univerſe ſhould, under *any* character, ſuffer and die, and be rewarded; this doctrine is a contradiction to the fundamental articles of Chriſtianity: and therefore cannot be the Truth. This Hereſy aroſe from endeavouring to preſerve to the Son, an Equality with the Father; and to maintain at the ſame time the doctrine of the Unity.—We are told by *Irenæus*, *Auſtin*, and *Theodoret*; that the Author of this Sect was *Simon Magus*.

The *Socinians*, on the other hand, argued from the general orthodox belief (that the Son of God had ſuffered and died;) that he could not be that Supreme God, whom all parties acknowledged to be impaſſible: *quippe Deo* παθήματα *nullo modo aſcribi poſſe*, ſays Biſhop *Bull*(*y*). And from thence they concluded (with the *Sabellians*), that he was a mere Man; who never did exiſt, till he was born of the Virgin *Mary:* but that he was conceived by the Holy Ghoſt, and for that reaſon was called the Son of God; for they did not believe, with the *Ebionites* and *Theodoſians*, that he was begotten by *Joſeph*. And, what is ſaid of the Word of God by St. *John*, they explain of the *Goſpel*; and not of a *real Perſon:* and theſe two articles

(*y*) Bulli Op. pa. 60.

are

are the criterion of this ſect; however thoſe who hold them may differ, upon matters of leſs importance.

Now, how plauſible ſoever this hypotheſis may be, upon the foot of Reaſon; ſo far as Chriſt is conſidered only as a Prophet ſent by God, upon the gracious deſign of inſtructing, and reforming the world, under the immediate influence and direction of God: yet, when the Chriſtian ſyſtem is deſcribed in the New Teſtament, as a *Mediatorial* Scheme, and *Chriſt* is conſidered as a *Saviour*; the *Socinian* principles are utterly inconſiſtent with the whole proceſs. For we are not ſaved by the Revelation of Chriſt, as a Prophet; but by his Power, as a King and Conqueror; when he led captivity captive, and received gifts for men: i. e. when, having conquered Sin and Death, he received the power of forgiving Sin, raiſing the Dead, and giving eternal Life. But theſe gifts and powers he received in reward of his Humility, in quitting the glory of his pre-exiſtent ſtate; as well as of his Sufferings and Obedience in this. It was becauſe He that was ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ, in the form of God, as he appeared in *Shechinah*, or ἐν δόξῃ Θεοῦ, to the Patriarchs; humbled himſelf, and took upon him the form of a Servant; that God hath given him a name, that is above every name; that at the name of *Jeſus* every knee

knee ſhould bow(z). Becauſe he emptied himſelf of his glory, which he had with God before the world was(a). That though he was rich, yet for Man's ſake he became *poor*; that *they* through *his* poverty might be *rich*(b). Theſe are the reaſons given us in Scripture, why he was exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour; and was made King of Kings, and Lord of Lords. And theſe things prove; that he was in a ſtate of Glory, before he came into this world. And accordingly we are told, as planely as can be; that he came down from Heaven(c). That he was before all things; and by him do all things conſiſt(d). That all things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made(e): That he was the Word, that was in the beginning with God, and was God. And beſides this, the extraordinary Love of God, in not with-holding his only-begotten Son, but freely giving him up for mankind, is ſpoken of in ſuch a manner; as proves him to have been a much greater Being than a mere Man; though made for a little while lower than the Angels. And this is clearly intimated in the words of Chriſt to the *Phariſees*; What think you of Chriſt? whoſe Son is he? They ſay unto him, The Son of

(z) Phil. xi. 6—10. (a) John xvii. 5. (b) 2 Cor. viii. 9. (c) John iii. 13. xiii. 3. xvi. 28. (d) Col. i. 17. (e) John i. 3.

David.

David. He ſaith unto them, How then doth *David* in Spirit call him Lord? Saying, The Lord ſaid unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footſtool. If *David* call him Lord, How is he his Son(*f*)? The Texts, that can only be underſtood upon theſe principles, are very numerous; which the Socinians attempt to explane away into a figurative meaning; never heard of before Socinus(*g*); but without ſucceſs; for he, that ſhall without prejudice examine their interpretation of the beginning of *St. John*'s Goſpel(*h*), will find it as far-fetch'd and as unſatisfactory, as Dr. *Henry More*'s Philoſophical and Metaphyſical Cabbala, upon the Three firſt Chapters of *Geneſis*.

Biſhop *Hoadly* ſays of them; that "they "ſeem to be vaniſhed, and not to have been "ſo much as ſpoken-of for many years; and "that their interpretations of ſome paſſages in "Scripture are univerſally rejected; as incon-"ſiſtent with all the beſt rules of interpre-"tation(*i*)." But however they ſeem to be growing again into Faſhion, as to their Doctrines; though they are aſhamed of the Name.

(*f*) Mat. xxii. 42. &c. Mar. xii. 37. Lu. xx. 41. Pſ. cx. 1. (*g*) Sandii Nuc. Hiſt. L. I. p. 228. (*h*) See Pearſon on the Creed, p. 116. Unitar. Tracts, Vol I. Tr. viii. p. 26. 43. Vol. II. Tr. iii. p. 27. Dawſon's Illuſtration of ſeveral Texts, p. 65, &c. (*i*) Anſwer to the Dean of Worceſter's Sermon, p. 4.

A late writer of this ſtamp objects to the *Sabellians*; that they conſider the *Word of God* only as an *Attribute*; whereas He ſuppoſes it to mean the *Goſpel*. But this is one of the chief errors of the *Socinians*; and what they labour *manibus pedibuſque* to eſtabliſh: and beſides, it is juſt the ſame thing, as to the *perſonal exiſtence* of the Son before all worlds; whether we believe the Word to mean an Attribute, with the *Sabellians*; or the Goſpel, with the *Socinians*. The ſame writer finds fault with the *Socinians*, and would appear to differ from them, by telling us, "They do not believe the *Fulneſs* "of the Godhead dwelt in the man Jeſus; but "repreſent him as one, in whom God did not "ſpeak; but who ſpake and wrought by his "*own* human Spirit: or who was taught of "God, but *partially*, as *Moſes* and the other "Prophets; receiving the Spirit by *meaſure* "only(*k*)." But it does not appear, that the *Socinians* in general had any ſuch notions. On the contrary, *Grotius*, who favours them, tells us; that "the *Plenitude* of the divine virtues "dwelt in Jeſus Chriſt: that is to ſay, it was "*perpetually* and *inſeparably* united; and not "by intervals, as in the Prophets(*l*)." And Mr. *Souverain*, the ſuppoſed author of *Platoniſm unveiled*, who is entirely *Socinian*, ſays; "This

(*k*) Dawſon's Illuſtration, &c. p. 84. 131. (*l*) Grotius on Col. 1. 19.

"is

" is what is called the *hypoſtatic union* of the di-
" vine with the human nature: even this *She-*
" *chinah* or this *perpetual* inhabitation of the
" Spirit of God in Jeſus Chriſt(*m*)." And again he expreſſes the very doctrine of this writer; " We need ſay no more than this; that " Jeſus in *himſelf* was a *Man*; and a *God* with " reſpect to God *dwelling in him*: ſo that the " Man is not the *Lord Jehovah*, but the Lord " is *in the Man*; and whatever Name he has, " and Power he clames; it is not the voice of " the Temple, but of Him who dwells in it(*n*)." Which was alſo the opinion of *Neſtorius* and *Photinus*(*o*).

This Hereſy of *Socinus*, we are told by *Sandius*, is a very modern one; for he ſays, no Chriſtian ever held the ſame opinion of Chriſt that Socinus did: but all the Heretics agree'd with the Orthodox and *Catholics* in *this*, that they determined the *Word of God* to be *God*: and to have exiſted before ages; and that the whole Univerſe was created by Him(*p*). The great care of this ſect was, to maintain the *Unity* and *Impaſſibility* of the *Father*; and in doing *this*, they degraded the nature and character of the Son. But there is no doubt they mean as well as thoſe, who ſee things in a

(*m*) Le Plat. Dev. part 2, ch. vi. (*n*) Le Plat. Dev. c. 22. (*o*) Sandii Nuc. 186. (*p*) Ibid. 117. 147.

different and a better light; and are forced into theſe principles, for fear they ſhould be obliged to admit of the Death and Sufferings of the *ſupreme God:* not being ſatisfied with the evaſions of the *Sabellians* and *Pſeudo-athanaſians*, both which fall in with the errors of *Cerinthus*.

We are now to conſider the *Arians*. The chief view of Theſe, as well as of the Orthodox, ſeems to have been; to ſteer their courſe between the two extremes of *Sabellianiſm* and *Socinianiſm*. To which purpoſe the *Arians* maintain, againſt the *Sabellians*, that the Son of God is a Being *diſtinct* and *different* from the Father; and not a mere *Virtue*, or *Character*, or *Mode of Exiſtence*: and againſt the *Socinians*, as well as the *Neſtorians* and *Sabellians*, who held *alium eſſe Deum Verbum, alium Chriſtum*(q); that Chriſt was not a mere Man, but a true God.

It is difficult to aſcertain the opinions of thoſe Heretics, whoſe works are deſtroyed; and the writings of *Arius* were condemned to the flames, under pain of death to all who ſhould concele them, by *Conſtantine*; as were thoſe of *Eunomius* the *Arian*, by *Arcadius*: a ſmall part of thoſe writings have eſcaped; and the account which is given of them by their enemies, is contradictory and inconſiſtent; being generally not the very words of the Heretics, but the

(q) Sandii Nuc. 191.

gloſſes

gloſſes and conſequences which their adverſaries have drawn from them unfairly; and which the Heretics themſelves diſavow.

The Creed which was delivered-in by *Arius* at the Council of *Jeruſalem* in 335, where his Faith was tried and approved, and he was reſtored to Alexandria and the favour of Conſtantine(*r*); was this: "We believe in one God, the Father Almighty; and in the Lord Jeſus Chriſt his Son, begotten of him before all ages; God the Word, by whom all things were made, which are in Heaven and in Earth; who came down and was incarnate, and ſuffered, and roſe again, and aſcended to the Heavens; and ſhall come again to judge the living and the dead: and in the Holy Ghoſt: the reſurrection of the Fleſh: the life of the world to come: and the Kingdom of Heaven: in one catholic church of God, extending itſelf from one end of the earth unto the other(*s*)." And the Creed of *Eunomius* begins; We believe in one God, the Father Almighty; *of* whom are all things: and in one only begotten, the Son of God, God the Word, our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; *by* whom are all things. And in his Apology he ſays; We believe alſo in the Son of God, the only begotten God, the firſt born of the whole

(*r*) See Appendix to the 8th Letter, No. III.

(*s*) Baxter's Ch. Hiſt. 53. See the appendix to 8th Letter, No. iii. Soc. l. i. c. 25, 26.

creation,

creation, Chriſt true God, not unbegotten(*t*). And Mr. *R. Baxter* tells us; the *Arians* maintained, that "*Tres ſunt Hypoſtaſes; Pater,* "*Filius, & Spiritus Sanctus*; and that God did "*ante ſempiterna tempora unigenitum filium gignere,* "*per quem & ſecula & reliqua procreavit omnia*; "viz. *ſubſiſtentem illum ſuapte voluntate condidiſſe,* "*ejuſmodi ut neque converti neque mutari poſſit,* "*perfectam Dei creaturam, ſed non tanquam rerum* "*creatarum aliquam; foetum itidem, ſed non tan-* "*quam unum e cæteris.* They thought; that, "before God made the reſt of the creatures, "he made one ſuperangelical perfect ſpirit, by "which he made all the reſt; and that this is "Chriſt: and that he received no other Soul, "but a Body only, at his Incarnation: and "this ſuperangelical ſpirit was his Soul. This, "Mr. *Baxter* ſays, was the dangerous Hereſy "of *Arius*." See two Epiſtles of *Arius* recorded by *Epiphanius*.

In ſhort the *Arians* ſeem to have believed that Chriſt was the Word of God, and was in the beginning with God: but was not the ſelf-exiſtent God, with whom he was in the beginning; but

(*t*) Fabritii Bib. Græ. vol. viii. 311. 252. and Cave's Hiſt. Lit. See Arius's Letters concerning his Faith, to Bp. Alexander and Euſebius, recorded by Epiph. Hær. 69. p. 731. 732, Ed. Par. and by Hilary lib. iv. tranſlated with the appendix to the 8th Letter, as alſo the long Creed of Eunomius delivered to Theodoſius as in Soc. Eccl. Hiſt. B. v. c. 10. in Valeſius's note.

his

his Son, created by the Father before all ages, one ſuperanglical and perfect Spirit; and thereby became his only Son, by whom he created all other Beings: and that when he came down from Heaven to inhabit the body, which was prepared for him in the Womb of the bleſſed Virgin; this ſuperangelical Spirit alone was the Soul that informed and enlivened it. Beſides theſe notions, they explaned themſelves upon others, which they received from Tradition, for which *Arius* was condemned; *viz.* That there was Duration before the Word was; ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν· that he was made out of nothing, ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων· and that he was not before he was begotten; πρὶν γενηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν. Theſe are his own words, in his letter, to *Euſebius*; "We ſuffer Perſecution; be-"cauſe we ſay, the Son hath a beginning; the "Father hath no beginning: on this account "we ſuffer Perſecution, and becauſe we aſſert "that he is of nothing(*u*)." And this aſſertion he defends in the ſame Letter, as follows. "If "the Father begat a Son, he that was begotten "had a beginning of his exiſtence; whence it "follows, that the Son was not always; and "conſequently, that he had his exiſtence of no-"thing(*x*)."

(*u*) *Perſecutiones patimur, quod dixerimus, Initium habet Filius, ſed Deus initio caret; propter hoc dictum perſecutiones patimur, & quod aſſeruimus eſſe de nihilo.* Sandii Nuc. l. 2. p. 10.

(*x*) *Si pater genuit filium eum qui genitus eſt ſuæ eſſentiæ habere principium: indeque perſpicuum eſſe filium aliquando non fuiſſe; neceſſaricque ſequi cum ex nihilo eſſentiam habuiſſe.*

To

To which his Adverſaries reply; that he exiſted, before he was begotten; and was begotten from the ſubſtance of the Father.

Biſhop *Bull* ſays; *Summa Doctrinæ*, all that the *Nicene* Fathers maintained againſt *Arius*, was this; that the Son of God was begotten of the proper ſubſtance of God, and thereby became very God of very God(*y*). And upon this queſtion the *Athanaſians* argued as follows; If Chriſt were *not* the *ſame* ſubſtance with the Father, he could not be *God*; and to deny his Divinity, is to give-up the fundamental Principle of Chriſtianity. And the *Arians* argued; If Chriſt *be* the *ſame* ſubſtance with the Father, he muſt be impaſſible, and did not ſuffer; and the fundamental Article of Chriſtianity is given-up by denying his Sufferings.

Beſides this the *Arians* thought it blaſphemous to aſſert a literal generation from the divine ſubſtance: and argued upon it as follows; *viz.* That, in ſuch a generation, either the ſubſtance of the Father muſt be divided; which is a denial of his ἀφθαρσία, or incorruptibility; or elſe the Father muſt, as to his undivided ſubſtance, be both Father and Son; and be compounded of two ſubſtances, one begotten and the other unbegotten; which is inconſiſtent with his ſimple

(*y*) *Sane autem Filium Dei ex propria Dei Subſtantia genitum ac proinde de Deo vero Deum verum eſſe, ſumma eſt Doctrinæ quam patres Nicæni contra Arium aſſeruerunt.* Bulli Op. p. 3.

Unity,

Unity. And to ſay, the Son exiſted before he was begotten; is not only improper and blaſphemous, but egregious Folly—for if he exiſted before he was begotten, he was unbegotten: ὅπερ ὐκ ἀτοπίας μόνον, ἢ βλασφημίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσης ἐυηθείος ὑπερβολὴν ἂν ἔχοι—ἰι γὰρ πρό τῆς γεννησίως ἦν, ἀγέννητος ἦν(z). And upon this account they rejected the word *homoouſious*.

This ſeems to be the general and fundamental argument in *Eunomius*; which runs through his book, and upon which his particular expreſſions are built, which naturally ariſe from this general principle; as I ſhall ſhew in the Notes(a). And becauſe Dr. *Cave* has given the opinions of *Arius*, in *Arius's* own words, I ſhall there take notice of them all; whereby you will ſee, not only wherein the *Arians* and *Athanaſians* differ; but judge of the true and genuine ſenſe of the *Arian* expreſſions, and whether they have endeavoured to explain away or ſoften their real ſentiments, as they are accuſed.

The opinions of many other Heretics upon the ſubjects of the Generation and Incarnation of Chriſt, if fairly examined into, will appear to have riſen from the very ſame cauſe; *viz.* from their endeavour to explain the ſeeming contradiction, how Jeſus Chriſt is *God*, and at the ſame time *capable* of ſufferings and death; and it was upon account of the extreme nicety, which is

(z) Fabrit. Bib. Græ. Vol. VIII. 278. (a) Note IX.

neceſſary in order to avoid Hereſy on one ſide or other of theſe queſtions; that thoſe who wrote againſt one Hereſy, were ſo often accuſed of falling into the contrary one; as *Dionyſius* the Great, *Alexander* of *Alexandria*, *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*(*b*), *&c.* And *Dupin* ſays, that *Origen* was obliged to uſe terms, which appeared to favour the oppoſite error. And among the Moderns here in *England*, the ſame misfortune has befallen Biſhop *Fowler*, Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*, Biſhop *Burnet*, *&c.* So that none of the great Men at preſent chooſe to explane themſelves upon theſe ſubjects. And if this was the caſe of *Orthodox* writers, when examined by one another, and the beſt ſenſe was put upon their words; what could the *Heretics* expect, who had no ſuch indulgence; but whoſe words were ſtrained the other way? or who can wonder that ſome men were condemned, and others acquitted; who had ſaid the very ſame things?

As to the vulgar notion, that the ancient Heretics (I mean thoſe that taught what they believed, and are therefore improperly called by that name) were in any reſpect worſe than other men; there is no good reaſon to ſuſpect it. They were as learned, and as ready to give-up their Preferments, or ſuffer Martyrdom, for Conſcience-ſake, as the Orthodox; and the learned men among the moderns, have fallen into

(*b*) Daillé Engliſh, 95.

many

many of the ſame opinions, for which They were condemned. So that, whatever the Vulgar may think, one would expect that Philoſophers and Scholars would be ſparing of ſuch reflections; when they ſee that men of the moſt unexceptionable characters in all reſpects, have taken different ſides in this argument. *Grotius*, and the *Fratres Poloni*, favour the *Socinians*: *Sandius*, *Eraſmus*, *Chillingworth*, *Epiſcopius*, *Petavius*, ſpeak favourably of the *Arians*(*c*). And we can have no reaſon to imagine, theſe great men were inſincere, or careleſs in their reſearches. In ſhort, what *Salvian* ſays of the *Arians*, is true of all Heretics of that kind; i. e. all who believed the Doctrines which they taught: "They are Heretics, but know it "not: Heretics to *Us*, but not to *Themſelves*. "Nay, they think themſelves ſo catholic; that "they judge Us to be Heretics: what They "are to Us, that We are to Them: they err, "but with a good mind; and for this cauſe "God ſhews mercy unto them(*d*)." And if the Orthodox, or *Arians*, had been as good Chriſtians as *Salvian*; they would have ſhewn mercy to one another: But *that* was a principle of Chriſtianity, ſcarce ever thought-of among them: What *Procopius* ſays of *Juſtinian*, was the general notion of the Chriſtians for many ages:

(*c*) Note X. (*d*) Salvianus de guber. Dei, L. v. p. 100. Edit. 2. Par. 1669.

" He did not believe he was guilty of Murder; " when he condemned to death thoſe, who " made profeſſion of a religion different from " his own(*e*)." But the Chriſtians have gone far beyond this; and maſſacred the members of their own churches, merely for differing upon ſubjects which neither ſide underſtood(*f*). This was what St. *John* was ſo amazed at, when he ſaw the Chriſtian Church drunk with the blood of the Saints and Martyrs of Jeſus; " And when I ſaw her, ſays he, I wondered " with great admiration(*g*)." St. *John* was not ſurpriſed, that the Chriſtians ſhould be perſecuted by the Heathens; for this he had ſeen before, in the reigns of *Nero* and *Domitian*: But that the members of the meek and holy Jeſus, ſhould know ſo little of the true ſpirit of Chriſtianity, as to murder one another; was a matter of the greateſt aſtoniſhment to him. And yet in this practical Apoſtaſy from the moſt eſſential part of Chriſtianity, their Love to one another, the very criterion by which he declares his ſubjects ſhould be known to belong to him; all Sects among them have agree'd without Exception: Orthodox and Heretic, Papiſt and Proteſtant, Churchman and Diſſenter; all in their turns have thought proper to

(*e*) Procop. in Anec. p. 60. Bennet's Irenicum.
(*f*) Note IV. (*g*) Rev. xvii. 6.

ſhew

ſhew their zele againſt the *nation-deſtroying ſin* of Toleration; as it was called in *Cromwell's* time: and for fetching the Devil out of other men's conſciences, have made no ſcruple of giving him a free entrance into their own; not knowing what ſpirit they were of. Good God! What amazing ignorance, prejudice, and preſumption! That men, frail men! who know not the eſſence of a blade of Graſs; and are liable to overſight, miſapprehenſion, and error, upon the planeſt ſubjects; ſhould dare to murder and damn their Fellow-Creatures, and Fellow-Chriſtians; for not agreeing with them in opinion about the Eſſence of the ſupreme God! O my Soul, come not thou into their Secret; unto their Aſſembly, O mine Honour, be not thou united(*b*).

I am now to conſider the opinions of the Orthodox, on theſe ſubjects. And here it is not only difficult to determine, what Orthodoxy is; but what Authors we are to conſult for information, and in what ſenſe they are to be underſtood(*i*).

For the Orthodoxy of the Church has been very different, in different Ages; and what is now called by that name in the Church of *Rome*, was not completed till the *Lateran* Council in 1215; and conſequently is not

(*b*) Geneſ. xlix. 6. (*i*) Daillé's right Uſe of Fathers, Cap. 3. Note XI.

above

above 556 years ſtanding: as I ſhall go on to prove.

1ſt. By ſhewing, that the Orthodoxy of the Church has been very different, in different Ages; and,

2d. By tracing the progreſs of Orthodoxy, through the ſeveral changes it has undergone; till it became what it now is.

1ſt. That the orthodoxy of the Church has been very different in different ages, appears from the writings both of Proteſtants and Papiſts. *Sandius* undertakes to prove in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, that all Antiquity was *Arian*; and Mr. *Jurieu*, the *French* Reformer, ſays; Every one knows this Myſtery [of the Trinity] remained *informé*, without its right form and ſhape, till the Council of *Nice*; nay, until that of *Conſtantinople*; (in 381, when the Holy Ghoſt was firſt decreed to be Lord:) and this he repreſents in two great points, the *temporal generation* of the Son, and his *inequality* to the Father; both which he ſhews by proper citations to have been unanimouſly profeſſed by the ancients of the three firſt ages(*k*).

And the Popiſh party make no ſcruple to confeſs; that the Doctrine of the Trinity, as it is now held, can neither be proved from Scripture; nor the conſent of the Ancients(*l*); whom they

(*k*) *Emlyn*'s Tracts, Vol. ii. 279. *Jurieu* Paſt. Let. 6. p. 126. 12mo. (*l*) Note XII.

accuſe

accuſe of Hereſy, becauſe they *differ* from them: reſolving the whole evidence of their Faith into the authority of the Church. Cardinal *Perron* taxes *Origen*, *Euſebius*, *Irenæus*, and *Tertullian*, with the ſame Hereſy; and ſays of all the Fathers before the Council of *Nice*, in general, that the *Arians* would gladly be tried by them: and accordingly *Eunomius*, the *Arian*(*m*), refers to Them; as of the ſame opinions with himſelf: and *Petavius* ſays, of *Juſtin Martyr*, and almoſt all the Fathers before that Council; *cum orthodoxæ fidei regula minime conſentiunt:* they do not at all agree with the rule of Orthodoxy(*n*): and accuſes them of *Platoniſm*, and of having corrupted the purity of the Chriſtian Faith(*o*). St. *Jerom* ſays, Before *Arius*, that deſtructive Dæmon, *(dæmonium meridianum)* appeared in the World, the Fathers had delivered many things innocently; and without taking ſo much heed to their words, as they might have done: and indeed ſome things, that can hardly eſcape the cavils of wrangling ſpirits(*p*). Accordingly, *Dupin* ſays of *Tertullian*; "He ſpeaks in a manner not intirely agreeable to the notions of "the later ages; but we muſt pardon the Ancients ſuch kind of expreſſions, who wrote before the terms they uſed were fixed to a certain

(*m*) *Eunom.* Apol. C. iv. (*n*) *Chillingworth*'s Preface, 17, 18. *Petav.* 269. ad Hær. 69. (*o*) *Cudworth*, 395. (*p*) Apol. con. Ruff. Daillé, Eng. p. 80.

"ſenſe

" ſenſe(q)." And ſpeaking of *Juſtin Martyr*, who ſays, " the Father is inviſible, the Son viſi-" ble, and the Majeſty of the Father greater " than that of the Son;" and of the opinion of *Theophilus*, Biſhop of *Antioch*; " that the Word " can be in a Place, and was begotten in " Time;" he ſays, " Theſe expreſſions, which " are common with the ancient Fathers; have " another ſenſe in their mouths, than that which " the *Arians* have given them ſince(r)." And of *Clemens Alexand:* he ſays; " He follows the " manner of the Ancients, in ſaying the Word " was viſible(s)." And in ſpeaking of the Opinion of *Origen*, that the Word and Spirit were made by the Father; he ſays, " Theſe ex-" preſſions are very common before the Council " of *Nice*; and too common with the Ancients, " to make it a crime in *Origen*(t)." And Biſhop *Bull* ſays; " He was really catholic, in the Ar-" ticle of the Trinity; though he ſometimes " ſpeaks otherwiſe than the Catholics do; which " is no more than almoſt all the Fathers did, " who lived before the Council of *Nice*(u)."

So that, according to theſe learned men; inſtead of finding the Opinion of the ancient Fathers in their works, we are to take it for grant-

(q) Par. Bib. p. 98. (r) Ibid. 67, note f. (s) Ibid. 84. (t) Ibid. 136. (u) Defen. Fid. Nic. Sect. xi. c. 9, 22.

ed

ed that they ſaid one thing, and mean'd the direct contrary; a very modeſt Poſtulatum! One would wonder, how learned men could talk in this manner; or imagine, that any one of common ſenſe would believe them. How much more probable is it, that the Faith of the Church *has* altered in *this* doctrine; as we find it *do's*, in almoſt every age, in *ſome* doctrine or other; according to the natural viciſſitude of circumſtances. And indeed, *Origen* is a moſt material evidence to prove this: who, though never queſtioned for any error in this matter, in or near his time; has cauſed ſo much diſpute ſince. "*St. Jerom, John of Jeruſalem, St. Epiphanius,* "*St. Auſtin,* and ſince them, *Theophilus, Juſti-*"*nian,* and the Fifth Council, did accuſe him "of Errors in the myſtery of the Trinity: and "on the contrary, the more ancient Writers, "*Didymus, St. Anthanaſius, St. Baſil, St. Gregory* "*Naz.* an anonymous Author quoted by *Photi-*"*nus, St. John Chryſoſtom,* and *Ruffinus,* cite "him againſt the *Arians*; as an Author, who "had orthodox notions of the Trinity; and "even defended It againſt its Enemies(*x*)." and *Demetrius,* who was his Biſhop and great Enemy, commends him for the purity of his Faith(*y*): nay, if we leave theſe authorities, and "conſult the part of his Works which we have

(*x*) *Dupin,* 135. (*y*) Reply to Dr. Waterland's Defence, 328. *Euſeb.* Hiſ. Eccles. L. 6. c. 7.

" in Greek; here again, ſays *Dupin*, we find a " Labyrinth not eaſy to get out of. We meet " things there; which do not appear leſs con- " trary, than the ſentiments of the authors that " have written for and againſt him(*z*)." and if this be the caſe, with regard to the primitive Fathers; we are ſo far from finding by Them, what is moſt Orthodox; that we are not enabled to diſtinguiſh the Orthodox from the Heretic: and (as Mr. *Souverain* obſerves from Mr. *Vaſſor*,) " we can receive no benefit from the Teſtimony " of the Antients, for the deciſion of thoſe " points, which are now controverted; upon " account of the embarraſſments, into which " their Philoſophy, hath brought them(*a*)." *Ruffinus* indeed, and others, alledged; that *Origen* had been corrupted by Heretics: but *Jerom* laughs at this notion; and contends, that it was not poſſible(*b*).

But, ſuppoſe it true; yet all the Fathers could not be corrupted: eſpecially, where ſo many of them have agreed in plane and regular Syſtems; which they have laid-down profeſſedly in many places, and taken pains to prove and eſtabliſh by many arguments.

Dupin endeavours to account-for this difference in the Faith of the Church, by ſaying;

(*z*) *Dupin.* (*a*) Le Platon. Dev. part 1. c. viii. Traité de l'examen. d. 1. p. 10. (*b*) Apol. ii. Adv. Ruſt. Reply to Dr. Waterland's defence, 325.

The

The Terms, which were uſed by the Ancients, were not then fixed to a certain Senſe; and *Petavius* ſays, The ſubjects were not explaned and underſtood: *nondum ſatis illuſtrata ac patefacta rei veritate.* But this is not ſufficient to account for the Fact. For admitting the Ancients had not fixed the ſame ſenſe to the words, Perſon, Subſtance, Nature, *&c.* which has been given them ſince; yet certainly they underſtood what they mean'd by ſaying, the Father was inviſible, and infinite, the Son viſible and finite. They knew what they mean'd, when they held the Generation of the Word to be *in Tempore*, a little before the Creation of the World; of whom the learned Dr. *Bull* has given a long liſt(*c*): and what they mean'd by declaring Chriſt to be the Angel of the Covenant, that appeared to the Patriarchs(*d*); which *Auſtin* hath ſince endeavoured to confute. They did not therefore differ from the Moderns, only in the uſe of abſtruſe terms; but in plane and intelligible doctrines: not becauſe they did not take heed to their Words, as *Jerom* ſuggeſts; but becauſe they were of different Opinions. And the reaſon of their differing, was; becauſe they had not ſettled a conſiſtent Scheme, between their Chriſtianity, and the Philoſophy they had introduced into it. Their firſt notions therefore, in the

(*c*) Note XIII. (*d*) Note XIV.

days of *Origen*, *Clemens*, *Alexandr.* &c. were crude and undigeſted. For example, *Origen* in one place tells us, that the Father and Son are one Subſtance, which the Greeks call *homoouſion*; and in the very next Chapter of the ſame Book, declares; that the Son is of another Subſtance, and created; *alterius ſubſtantiæ, & creatum*: as we are informed by *Ruffinus*(*e*). And afterwards when they began to examine theſe ſubjects at the Council of *Nice*, and reduce them into a Syſtem; they were divided into parties: and *Epiſcopius* ſays, in the midſt of party rage and fury, and upon principles which were taken up on a ſudden, they had rather huddled-up a Creed for the Church, than ſeriouſly conſidered the ſubjects of debate(*f*). And *Melchior Canus* (*g*) ſays; "It is an uſual thing, believe me, for all the "Judges of the Church, when they publiſh "their decrees, to be driven-on by a certain "Raſhneſs and Suddenneſs of judgment, as by a "Wind: ſo that they effect nothing, which "may be looked upon as ſolid, grave, or cer-"tain".

Mr. *Jurieu* indeed ſays; the difference of theſe points made no alteration in the Chriſtian Faith: and "that all the vain and forced ſpeculations "of the Doctors of that time, [the Fathers of "the three firſt ages] did not hinder the purity

(*e*) Bulli Op. p. 29. (*f*) Epiſcop. Note XV.
(*g*) Loci Theol. l. 5. c. 5.

"of

" of the Faith of the Church; *that is* of the " People. They did not reach ſo far, as to " Them; they remaned in the plane Doctrines; " and the reſt was for the ſpeculative Divines, " the Philoſophers brought-up in the ſchool of " *Plato*; ſuch as were *Juſtin Martyr*, *Tatian* his " diſciple, *Athenagoras* another *Platoniſt*, and " others of the ſame ſort." He ends with ſaying; " Every one knows, that Theological Ex- " plications are not a part of the Faith: *ne ſont* " *de Foy*(*b*)." In ſhort, he ſeems to be as much afraid of admitting a change in the Faith of the Church; as if he were a Romaniſt, and his whole Religion depended upon the Church's infallibility. In like manner we are told by *Origen*, that Chriſtians are divided into two claſſes; the firſt, of Infants in the Faith; who are governed by Evangelical Principles: the ſecond, of intelligent and elevated Souls; who are capable of comprehending the Divinity of the Word-God glorified(*i*). And he acquaints his Readers, in the beginning of his Book περὶ Ἀρχῶν, that the ſacred Writers do not concern themſelves with abſtruſe matters and ſpeculative points; which few of them whom they called to the Chriſtian Religion were capable of underſtanding: but confined themſelves to thoſe few clear articles, which were neceſſary for the reformation of the

(*b*) Tabl. du Socin. Part 1. Let. 6. Le Plat. Dev. c. xix. (*i*) Ibid. 275. c. xxi. Ibid. ch. xxi

World;

World; to bring them into a ſtate of Righteouſneſs, and give them hopes of Immortality: leaving the more refined Contemplations, which were not contrary to prime Truths, to the commendable Curioſity of thoſe, whom Nature and Education qualified for ſuch enquiries(*k*).

But this is not the caſe at preſent: for, whether the Chriſtians are now grown to be all of them Philoſophers and *elevated Souls*, or whatever be the reaſon; the *Philoſophical Theology*, which was confined to learned men in the days of *Origen*, and upon which they could never agree; is now looked-upon as a fundamental part of the Chriſtian Religion, and uſed in the common ſervice of the Churches; the Laws for deſtroying Heretics are founded upon it; it is conſidered as a ſufficient ground for Perſecution in this world; and Damnation in the next; the Ignorant are as much concerned in it, as the Learned; being ſubject to the ſame Penalties, if found guilty of Hereſy; and it is eſteemed to be as much a part of the Faith, in the proſecutions by Law for Hereſy, as the Scripture itſelf: and conſequently, an alteration in theſe Doctrines, is an alteration in the Doctrines of the Church; to all intents and purpoſes.

Having now ſhewn, that the Orthodoxy of the Church has been very different, in different

(*k*) Le Platon dev.

Ages;

Ages; I ſhall procede to trace the progreſs of it, till it became what it now is.

If we conſult the primitive Fathers of the Church in the firſt ages, ſuch as *Clemens Romanus*, *Hermas*, *Polycarp*, *&c*; we ſhall receive little or no information, upon thoſe metaphyſical points; which have ſince been looked-upon to be fundamental articles, and teſts of orthodoxy. They are ſo remarkable for ſpeaking in the plane ſtyle of the Apoſtles, and not entering into metaphyſical queſtions; that the Critics judge of the antiquity of their writings, by their being free from ſuch ſubjects: the very word Trinity being unknown in the Church, till after the year 200(*l*); and the myſteries of the Trinity and Incarnation not ſpoken-of in form, till after the fourth age of the Church; nor the word *Hypoſtaſis* uſed, to ſignify *Divine Perſon*, till the end of the fourth(*m*).

The Fathers who ſucceded theſe, were brought up in the Schole of *Alexandria* in *Egypt*(*n*); and not contented with the ſimplicity of the Goſpel, which was to the *Greeks* Fooliſhneſs; endeavoured to embelliſh it with all the ornaments of the Academy: and the Chriſtian Theology was explaned according to the Platonic Syſtem; and agreed in ſome things with the notions after-

(*l*) Dupin in Theophilus. (*m*) Ibid. Tom. i. page 36.
(*n*) Note XVI.

wards

wards held by the *Arians*, and in others with the *Nicene* Council. Biſhop *Stillingfleet* obſerves what tampering there was by times, to bring Chriſtianity down to Philoſophy; rather than to make Philoſophy truckle under the ſimplicity of the Scriptures(*o*). And *Huetius* ſays, they rather endeavoured to accommodate the Scriptures to the *Platonic* Philoſophy of the *Alexandrian* School; than to reform that School by the help of the Scriptures. And accordingly, *Dupin* has obſerved of *Juſtin Martyr*; *Il eſt vray que ſur la Trinité il ſemble eſtre different de Nous, en ſuivant ces principes des Platoniciens*(*p*): He ſeems to differ from us about the Trinity, by following the principles of the Platoniſts.

Now the Philoſophy of the *Platoniſts* ſuppoſed a ſubordination and dependency of the ſecond and third Hypoſtaſis upon the firſt: which was not only the belief of *Juſtin Martyr*, but of *Clemens Alexand: Origen*, and others of the *Alexandrian* School; and was maintained by the generality of the Chriſtian Doctors, for the firſt three hundred years after the Apoſtles time; who planely aſſerted the ſame, as *Athenagoras*, *Tertullian*, *Gregory*, *Thaumaturgus*, *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, *Lactantius*, and many others(*q*); and therefore till that time, the generality of the

(*o*) Orig. Sac. p. 349. (*p*) *Dupin*. Tom. i. 59.
(*q*) Cudworth, 595.

Chriſ-

Chriſtian Fathers repreſent the Platonic Philoſophy as really the ſame with the Chriſtian; or ſo near it, that they chiefly differed in circumſtances and manner of expreſſion(*r*).

Upon which account, Biſhop *Burnet* ſays, (in his Animadverſions on Mr. *Hill*;) "It does "not become Mr. *Hill* to find fault with the "Biſhop, for having aſſerted; that the Fathers, "before the Council of *Nice*, did conceive in "the Trinity a Subordination, importing an "Inequality of the two laſt Perſons with the "firſt. The Biſhop has but too many proofs "upon this Article; and none but thoſe who "never read the Ancients, or read them without "attention, diſown it." This is acknowledged by *Petavius*, Dr. *Cudworth*, and *Huetius*(*s*).

Another difference between theſe Fathers and their Succeſſors, no leſs remarkable, is what Biſhop *Bull* obſerves; *viz.* "That almoſt all "the Catholic Writers, before *Arius*'s time, "ſeem not to have known any thing of the In-"viſibility and Immenſity of the Son of God; "and that they often ſpeak of him in ſuch a "manner, as if, even in reſpect of his divine "Nature, he was finite, viſible, and circum-"ſcribed in place(*t*)." And it was from theſe principles, that the Fathers who lived before the

(*r*) Cudworth, 621. and *Jurieu*'s Paſt. Letters in French, 12mo. Letter vi. (*s*) Animadverſions on Mr. *Hill*'s Book, p. 30. (*t*) Def. Fid. Nic. § 4. C. iii. p. 267.

Nicene Council argued; that "the Father alone "being of his own Nature inviſible, the appa- "ritions of God mentioned in the Old Teſta- "ment, could not be aſcribed to Him: but "they muſt be referred only to the *Logos*; as to "him, whom the Father has not only employed "as a Miniſter in the Creation; but by whom "he always reveles himſelf under the Old Teſt- "ment(*u*)." But as this notion contradicted the doctrine of Conſubſtantiality, which the Orthodox afterwards eſtabliſhed at the Council of *Nice* againſt the *Arians*; it became out of repute and has been very little regarded ever ſince, tho' ſo generally received before.

"This Notion," ſays Biſhop *Burnet*, "ſup- "poſed the Father and Son were not of the "ſame Nature [Conſubſtantial]: and without "doubt, this was the reaſon that *St. Auſtin* did "reject and confute it; as appears in his book "of the Trinity; and obliged thoſe, by whom "it was received, to reject it(*x*)." But this favourite Doctrine of Conſubſtantiality ſeems itſelf alſo to have been an Innovation in the Chriſtian Faith; and does not appear to have been generally received, till that time. For we are told by *Athanaſius*; that the eighty Fathers, who condemned *Samoſatenus*, affirmed expreſsly; that the Son is not of the ſame

(*u*) Animadverſions on Mr. *Hill*'s book, p. 46. (*x*) Ibid.

Eſſence

Eſſence with the Father: and by *Hilary*, that they rejected the Conſubſtantiality(*y*): and Dr. *Cave* ſays; it was the Hereſy of *Samoſatenus*, that he denied the Word to be a diſtinct Subſtance from the Father: So that it ſhould ſeem, *Samoſatenus* was condemned for holding the ſame *homoouſian* Doctrine, which is now ſuppoſed to be Orthodox.

I ſhall now conſider the Orthodoxy, that was ſettled at the Council of *Nice*.

When the *Platoniſts* of the *Alexandrian* Schole ran into debates, about the metaphyſical Nature of the ſecond *Hypoſtaſis*; the Chriſtian Church of *Alexandria* became embroiled in the ſame Diſpute. Biſhop *Alexander* maintained, that the *Logos* exiſted from all Eternity; and was of the ſame Subſtance with the Father: and *Arius*, as Archbiſhop *Teniſon* ſays, "being "heated with the diſpute, oppoſed him with "Obſtinacy and Uproar(*z*);" for he accuſed him of *Sabellianiſm*(*a*): a plane proof, that the word *homoouſios* was then capable of the ſame ſenſe, in which it was condemned in *Samoſatenus*. The Doctrine of *Alexander* was agreable to that of the *Platoniſts*(*b*); who held that the ſecond and third *Hypoſtaſis* proceded from the firſt, and were of the ſame *generical* Nature; which the

(*y*) Note X. (*z*) *Teniſon* of Idol. 158. (*a*) *Euſeb.* l. 5. c. 2. 21. 22. 23. Soc. l. 1. *Bennet*'s Iren. 43. (*b*) Note XVI

Platoniſts expreſſed by the word ὑπόστασις, and the *Nicene* Council, by ὁμοούσιος, or Conſubſtantial. But this word was not mean'd at that time to include an Equality, as to the *natural* or *moral* Attributes of God; (to which it was afterwards extended by Inference:) but merely to his *metaphyſical* Eſſence or Subſtance(*c*). The Father and Son were ſuppoſed to be Conſubſtantial, by the *Nicene* Fathers; in the ſame Senſe in which all men are Conſubſtantial to one another: and conſequently equal, as to their Eſſence. For, as *Petavius* obſerves, in Identity there can be no Diverſity or Inequality. But they did not yet venture to argue, from an Equality of Subſtance, to an Equality in natural and moral Perfections; though they hereby laid the foundation for it, and for all other Doctrines, which were unavoidably derived from it by inference.

Biſhop *Bull* gives us the opinion of the *Nicenes*, as follows: "The Father, Son, and "Holy Ghoſt, being in reality three Perſons, "[he means real Subſiſtences, ἐνυπόστατοι] yet they do not, as three Men, exiſt apart and ſeparate; but intimately cohere and join to each other, and, as I may ſo ſay, penetrate *(immeare invicem & penetrare)* each other: by an ineffable *Perichoreſis*, which the Scholemen call *Circumineſſion*:" from whence *Petavius* contends, that the numerical Union is neceſſarily effected(*d*).

(*c*) Note XVII. *Daillé*, p. 80. (*d*) *Bulli* Op. 130. ſee Note XVI.

Ac-

According to this opinion, each of the three Perſons has a particular Subſtance to itſelf; and theſe three are joined together into one: So that, as Dr. *Waterland* obſerves, the Subſtance of one Perſon is not the Subſtance of either of the other, but different; however of the ſame kind or united to them(*e*).

From hence it came to be a queſtion, even among the moſt orthodox; whether the Father and Son ſhould be called δύο πράγματα, or ἓν πρᾶγμα· two Beings, or one. *Origen*, and *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, were blamed for calling them δύο πράγματα, and *Baſil* calls it a *Sabellian* expreſſion to call them ἓν πρᾶγμα· and obſerves, very juſtly, that a thing is not Conſubſtantial to, or with itſelf; but one thing with another(*f*). The ſame queſtion aroſe afterwards, with regard to the word *Hypoſtaſis*, or Subſtance; upon which, *Jerom* wrote to Pope *Damaſus*, to enquire whether he ſhould ſay *one* Hypoſtaſis or *three*; and the queſtion ſtill remains: though the Council of *Alexandria* in 362, decree'd; that thoſe who held one Hypoſtaſis, and thoſe who held three, were all of the ſame opinion.

But though the Doctrine of the *Nicene* Fathers, when preciſely expreſſed, appropriated the *equality* between the three Hypoſtaſes, to the divine *Subſtance* or *Eſſence only*, agreably to

(*e*) *Philal. Cantab.* Remarks on Dr. *Waterland*'s ſecond Defence, 14. (*f*) *Baſil.* Epiſ. ccc.

the

the doctrine of the *Platoniſts*; yet this reſtriction or limitation was not obſerved by all of them: but many, who were accounted Orthodox, becauſe they zelouſly oppoſed *Arianiſm*; conſidered this equality as relative to the *perſonal* Attributes alſo: arguing very juſtly from the *Nicene* Principles, that if the Subſtance of the Son was of the ſame *generical* Nature with that of the Father; he muſt in like manner be *impaſſible*, *infinite*, and *inviſible*. This was a language very little, if at all, uſed before the *Arian* Controverſy: but afterwards, every one being looked upon as a favourer of *Arius*, who ſhould ſpeak the language of the ancient Fathers; while there was no danger of ſwerving too far on the oppoſite ſide of the queſtion; the ſtyle of the Chriſtian Writers became very much altered: and they began to ſpeak of Chriſt in ſuch high terms, as rendered him in every reſpect equal to the Father; and conſequently incapable of local Motion, Incarnation, and Sufferings. And from hence aroſe another opinion of the Orthodox; which was not only oppoſite to the Fathers of the three firſt Centuries, but alſo to *Athanaſius* and the *Nicene* Council. "And this was induſtriouſly purſued by *Gregory Nyſſen*, *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, *Maximus* the martyr, and *Damaſcen*; beſides ſeveral others both of the *Greeks* and *Latins*; and theſe were they, who principally inſiſted upon the *abſolute*

Co-

Co-equality, and *independent Co-ordination* of the three Hypoſtaſes; conſidering them as three *Individuals*, diſtinct from one another as three Men are; having no eſſential dependence upon one another, any more than *Thomas*, *Peter* and *John*; having the ſame ſpecific Eſſence, and only a *numerical* Difference; and ſo equal in all reſpects to one another: which ſeems to be the Doctrine of the *Athanaſian* Creed(*g*).

But this opinion was intangled with very great difficulties. As firſt, it ſeemed to contradict the words of Chriſt, when he declares, "The Fa-"ther is greater than I." However, this Difficulty they endeavoured to clear themſelves from, by explaining the Words as if they related to the Humanity of Chriſt only; and he mean'd to inform his Diſciples, that the eternal ſelf-exiſtent God was greater than a mere Man born of a Woman; which, as Dr. *Cudworth* ſays, is by no means probable. Whereas *Athanaſius*, *Baſil*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, and *Chryſoſtom*, with ſeveral others of the *Latins*, interpret the ſame to have been ſpoken of the Divinity of Chriſt(*h*).

Again, this notion ſeemed to contradict the fundamental Articles of Chriſtianity. For if Chriſt was immutable and impaſſible, he could not ſuffer; and if he was infinite, he was incapable of local motion, and could not *deſcend from Heaven to be born*. To the firſt of theſe ob-

(*g*) Cudworth 603. Note XXIX. (*h*) Ibid. 599.

jec-

jections they answered; that he did not suffer in his *Divine*, but in his *human* Nature: which shall be considered by and by. But to the second, they had no such subterfuge; but were obliged sometimes to assert it, and sometimes to deny it, as it served their purpose. The confusion or dishonesty of the Fathers after *Arius*'s time, in speaking of Christ sometimes as if he were unchangeable, impassible, invisible, and immense; and at other times as taking the form of a Servant, appearing in a human form, descending from Heaven, and suffering pain and death; is very remarkable. When they argued against the *Apollinarists*, they asserted; that the Divinity of Christ *could not* descend into Hell: because it was *infinite*, and consequently incapable of local motion; and afterwards, when they found the contrary Doctrine more to their purpose, argued that the Godhead *did* descend into Hell; accompanying his Soul thither(*i*). Lastly, it planely followed from this System, that the three Hypostases being *Distinct* and *equal*, must be three Gods; as *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, are three Men: (this objection the *Platonists* and *Athanasians* had foreseen and guarded against, by supposing the three Hypostases to be inseparably conjoined, and to have a mutual inbeing and circumincession; which they called by the

(*i*) Note XVIII.

word

word ἐμπεριχώρησις(k). "And therefore these "learned Men, in defence of their Hypotheſis, "were obliged to maintain with their Logic, "that three men are improperly called three, "and are really and truly but one; becauſe "there is but one and the ſame ſpecific Eſſence "or Subſtance of Human Nature in them all: "and ſeriouſly perſuaded men to lay aſide that "language. And by the ſame reaſon, ſays Dr. "*Cudworth*, all Men may be proved one Man: "and all the Epicurean Gods one God(l)."

To avoid this charge of believing three Gods, "When this Trinity came afterwards to "be charged as Tritheiſtic, they changed the "Syſtem once more; and in the room thereof, "there ſtarted up that other Trinity of *Perſons* "*numerically* the ſame, as having all *one*, and the "*ſame* ſingular exiſtent Eſſence. A doctrine "which, *Petavius* himſelf allows, was never "entertained by the *Nicene* Fathers, and the "firſt oppoſers of *Arianiſm*:" and Dr. *Cudworth* has proved it. And he ſays, "it ſeemeth not "to have been owned by any public authority, "ſave that of the *Lateran* Council only(m)." And this Council was held ſo late as 1215; under *Innocent* the Third, the ſame Pope that eſtabliſhed Tranſubſtantiation: of whom Biſhop *Tonſtal* ſays, "He did not know what he did, "when he eſtabliſhed it; and that he had no

(k) Cudworth, 590. Note XVI. k. (l) Cudworth, 604. (m) Ibid. 604.

"learned Men about him(*n*)." And Archbiſhop *Tillotſon* ſays, "Tranſubſtantiation came-in "with Idolatry, and was made uſe of to ſupport "it, in the days of the groſſeſt Ignorance, Su-"perſtition, and Vice(*o*)." In ſhort, it was at a time; when "Many dignified Eccleſiaſtics "could not ſubſcribe the Canons of thoſe Coun-"cils, in which they ſat as Members(*p*)." And the Pope himſelf has given us a notable inſtance of his infallibility in Critical Knowledge, in his Oration at the opening of the Council; in which he derives the word *Paſcha*, which is of *Hebrew* extraction, from the *Greek* word πάσχω *patior*(*q*). Thus they changed from one extreme to the other: from Tritheiſm to the Epicurean Trinity (*r*), or the Trinity of the Scholes; which Dr. *Cudworth* calls a *Sabellian* jargonry. The Author of it is ſaid to have been *Peter Lombard*, Archbiſhop of *Paris*, called the Maſter of the Sentences, who died in 1164; though ſome ſay it was invented by *Abelard*, an *Unitarian*(*s*), which is not improbable; and though it was oppoſed by divers learned Men, and cenſured by *Alexander* the Third, and other Popes, it was declared Orthodox in the Fourth Council of *Lateran*(*t*), in favour of *Peter Lombard*, and in op-

(*n*) Note XIX. (*o*) On Tranſubſtantiation. (*p*) Dr. *Robertſon*'s Hiſtory of *Charles* the Fifth, Vol. i. p. 233. (*q*) *Daillé*, 49. (*r*) Note XXI. (*s*) Unitar. Tr. Collect. ii. laſt Tr. p. 11. 25. (*t*) Note XX.

po-

poſition to Abbot *Joachim:* and is looked upon by the *Romaniſts* as the ſtandard of Orthodoxy. But the Proteſtants in this Country are much divided about it.

Hitherto the Orthodox, though they differed from one another in the particulars already mentioned, yet agreed in the main with the primitive Fathers; that the Chriſt, who ſuffered for Mankind, was a living Subſtance, diſtinct from the Father. Biſhop *Bull* tells us, that "It is moſt "certain; the primitive Fathers, by the *Logos*, "or Word, who exiſted before the creation of "the World, and by whom the World was "made, did not underſtand any power *(virtu-* "*tem)* of God, *unſubſtantial*, [ἀνυπόστατον] but a "*living* and *ſubſiſting* Word, which we com-"monly call *Perſon*. And it is equally certain; "that thoſe primitive Fathers held, that the "Word was a Perſon *diſtinct* from God the Fa-"ther, and the Holy Spirit(*u*)." But by the Decree of this Council, this Faith was entirely altered; for it does not ſuppoſe the Word to be a *diſtinct* Subſiſtence from the Father, or a living Agent differing from him in Number; but merely a *Power*, or a *Virtue*, or a *Mode of Exiſtence:* and ſo it ſeems to be believed by moſt of the reformed Churches(*x*).

(*u*) Bull. de Jeſ. Chriſti Divin. 17. (*x*) See Note XX. XXXII.

Mr. *Richard Baxter*, in his Church Hiſtory, tells us; that *Peter Lombard*'s Opinion, adopted by the *Lateran* Council, was this: *Quædam ſumma res eſt Pater, Filius, & Spiritus S. nec generans, nec genita, nec procedens.* Inſtead therefore of obviating the objection to the former notion of the Trinity, that it ſuppoſed *three* Gods; this Council ſeems to have made it very uncertain, whether there are not *four*. For if this Being, this *ſumma res*, did neither beget, nor was begotten, nor proceded; it ſhould ſeem that he muſt be neither Father, Son, nor Holy Ghoſt: but ſomething different from them all.

Let us now conſider, whether by the deciſion of this Council the Moderns are brought to agree in their Orthodoxy, better than the Ancients. Dr. *South*, Dr. *Wallis*, Mr. *Hooker*, and the Schole-men, who are called *Nominals*, becauſe they do not believe the Three Perſons to be *real Subſiſtences*, but merely *Names*, *Attributes*, *Modes of exiſtence*, *Relations*, *Properties*, *States*, or *Poſtures*; explane themſelves as follows.

Some repreſent the Three Perſons, as Three *Acts* of God, whereby he is denominated according to Three different Characters or Perſons; (ſo the word *Perſona* is uſed by *Cicero*) (*y*) as a Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier. Others ſay, the three Perſons are not mere Acts; but the

(*y*) De offic. l. 1. c. 30. 32.

At-

Attributes of *Goodneſs*, *Wiſdom*, and *Power*; or Three *relative Subſiſtences*: but ſo that their *Subſiſtence* is nothing elſe but their *Relation*, as the ſame Man may be ſaid to ſuſtain the Three Perſons of a Father, a Son, and a Huſband.

To theſe are oppoſed the *Realiſts*; who underſtand Perſon in the common acceptation of the word, as Archbiſhop *Tillotſon* expreſſes himſelf; and believe the different Perſons, to be different Subſiſtences, Minds, or Spirits; of which opinion were Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*, Biſhop *Bull*, Biſhop *Fowler*, Dr. *Cudworth*, *Epiſcopius*, Dr. *Sherlock*, Mr. *How*, Dr. *Clarke*, Dr. *Waterland*, &c. and many of theſe make no ſcruple to contemn and ridicule the *Nominals*. Mr. *How* calls *Peter Lombard*, one of the Four Evangeliſts of Antichriſt; and Biſhop *Fowler* thinks, they will only make ſport for the *Socinians*; Dr. *Cudworth*, as we are told, calls their Notions, the Philoſophy of *Gotham*, and *Sabellian* jargonry(z); and Dr. *Sherlock* ſays, "To ſay there are Three divine "Perſons, and not Three diſtinct infinite Minds "is both Hereſy and Nonſenſe—They are Three "Intelligent Beings—Father, Son, and Holy "Ghoſt, are as really diſtinct Perſons as *Peter*, "*James* and *John*—We muſt allow the Divine "Perſons to be real Subſtantial Beings—The

(z) Unit. Tracts, Vol. II. Treatiſe the laſt, p. 25.

"Three

"Three Divine Beings are Subſtantially diſ-
"tinct(*a*)."

On the other ſide, at the Univerſity of *Oxford*, [*November* 25, 1695] Mr. Vice Chancellor, with the Heads of the Colleges and Halls, in a General Meeting, judged and decree'd the Principles of the *Realiſts* [viz. *That there are Three infinite diſtinct Minds and Subſtances in the Trinity, and that the three Perſons in the Trinity are three diſtinct infinite Minds*;] to be falſe, impious, heretical, contrary to the Doctrine of the Catholic Church, and eſpecially of the Church of *England*(*b*).

To which the *Realiſts* anſwer; that, "What
"the *Oxford* Heads have condemned as hereti-
"cal and impious, is the very Catholic Faith:
"and that this Decree, or Declaration, cenſures
"the *Nicene* Faith, and the Faith of the Church
"of *England*, as Hereſy; and expoſes both to
"the Scorn and Triumph of the *Socinians*(*c*)."
And Dr. *Sherlock* ſays, I will undertake, any day in the year, to procure a Meeting of twice as many as wiſe and learned men to cenſure their Decree(*d*).

(*a*) Sherlock's Vindicat. of the Divinity of the bleſſed Trinity, p. 105. and 47. Unit. Vol. IV. Tr. V. p. 27. (*b*) Ibid. Vol. IV. Tr. II. p. 3. (*c*) Ibid. Vol. V. Tr. V. p. 23. Examination of the Oxford decree, p. 46. (*d*) *Sherlock*'s modeſt Examination, p. 6.

It

It ſeems therefore, that the Church of *England* has not yet ſettled this important Article; nor determined any where in expreſs words, whether there is in truth *One* infinite Mind; for which belief *Van Pere* was burn'd in *Smithfield:* or whether there are *Three* infinite Minds, *(tres ſpiritus ſubſtantiali numero differentes)* for which belief *Val. Gentilis* was beheaded by the Proteſtant Senate of *Bern.* And ſhe has great Reaſon to applaud her own Wiſdom, in leaving this matter as ſhe found it; whether ſhe conſiders in what a miſerable manner the other Chriſtian Churches have explained it(*e*); or the diviſions and animoſities, which an authoritative determination either way would have cauſed.

Beſides this difference between the *Realiſts* and *Nominals*, whether there be Three infinite Minds that govern the Univerſe, or One only; the *Realiſts* differ no leſs among themſelves: one Party believes the three Minds or Perſons to be every way *equal*, and that *each One* is equal to *all Three*; becauſe, if *either* were imperfect, *he* could not be *God.* To which their adverſaries reply; If they be *all equally perfect*, they muſt be *Three Gods*; for the ſame Reaſon that *each* muſt be infinitely perfect, to be *one* God.

Upon this account moſt of the learned moderns object to the Equality as Tritheiſtic; and

(*e*) Note XXII. Cudworth 605.

ſup-

ſuppoſe the Son and Spirit to be inferior to the Father in all things, but only this; that they are co-eternal, and have all the Divine Attributes that are communicable; not of Themſelves, but from the Father. *Epiſcopius*(*f*), and Dr. *Cudworth*(*g*), largely defend this: and condemn thoſe of undeniable Tritheiſm, who make the Son and Spirit in all things equal to the Father: and theſe are followed by *Clarke*, *Jackſon*, &c.

But to this the other *Realiſts* anſwer; that, if the Son and Spirit be ſubordinate, then, either the Father only is God; or elſe there is one *great* God, and two *inferior* Ones.

To this it is replied; that the Word *God* is uſed in the Scripture in different Senſes: and that, when Chriſt is called God; it does not mean the ſelf-exiſtent God; but his Son. For if he was the ſelf-exiſtent God, he would not be the Son of God, but the Father himſelf; or rather, there would be neither Father nor Son: and if he was both, he muſt be his own Father and his own Son.

The other *Realiſts* look upon this to be no better than *Arianiſm*; and contend, in their different Schemes; ſome of them, that the three Perſons are one God, by a cloſe Unition of their Subſtances; others ſay, by a mutual Conſciouſneſs to one another's Thoughts and Actions;

(*f*) Epiſc. Inſtitut. l. 4. c. 32. (*g*) Intel. Syſ. 303, 304.

and

and others, becauſe they are in one another by a kind of *Emperichoreſis*.

To all which their adverſaries, both *Realiſts* and *Nominals*, anſwer; that the *manner* in which the Three Perſons exiſt, is not the queſtion. If they are each of them Almighty, Omniſcient, and Perfect God, they muſt be Three perfect Gods; whether they be mutually conſcious or not, whether in or out of one another, whether united or diſunited; except they be ſo united, as to be one and the ſame: which is *Sabellianiſm*.

The arguments therefore are the ſame now, as at the Council of *Nice*: and the Doctrine of the Three Perſons and One God is ſubſcribed to by the *Realiſts* and *Nominals*, as the word ὁμοούσιος was then by the *Athanaſians* and *Sabellians*; the difference in Opinion being much the ſame. For we are told by *Socrates* the Hiſtorian(*b*), that "After the Council of *Nice*, the Biſhops "wrangled about the word ὁμοούσιος· and thoſe "that were for it, were cenſured by the contra-"ry party as *Sabellians*, and were called impious "becauſe they deſtroyed the *real* exiſtence of the "Son;" which is the very accuſation the *Realiſts* now bring againſt the *Nominals*, for ſuppoſing the Son and Spirit to be only *Modes of exiſtence*, or Names of the Father; "and thoſe that were

(*b*) Lib. i. c. 23. Bulli Op. p. 28. See Note XXIII.

" againſt ὁμοούσιος, were condemned by ſuch as " were for it, as reviving Gentiliſm or the Be- " lief of more Gods;" which is the ſame accuſa- tion, that the *Nominals* now bring againſt the *Realiſts:* ſo that the difficulties are now juſt the ſame, as they were at the Council of *Nice*; and no more likely to be ſettled(*i*).

This appears to be the preſent State of the Controverſy in the Chriſtian Church; and con- ſequently the queſtion, what is Orthodoxy, or where it is to be found; is as difficult to anſwer, as ever it was. It is indeed extremely eaſy to be Orthodox in *Words*; becauſe the ſame Creeds have been always kept up in the Church, what- ever Party got uppermoſt; though they ſo often changed their Faith. But to know the true Or- thodox ſenſe of thoſe Creeds, has been thereby rendered more difficult than ever. If the words *Conſubſtantial* and *Perſon*, had no determinate ſenſe at the Council of *Nice*; how can we ever expect to aſcertain one now? and if Conſubſtan- tial may mean *generical* as well as *identical* Sub- ſtance, and Perſon may mean either an Attribute or a *Subſiſtence*; what can prevent honeſt Men of the moſt oppoſite Notions, from ſubſcribing to the *ſame Words*; which ſome People have ſo much wondered at? Hence it happens; that, as on the one hand it is extremely difficult for

(*i*) Unit. Tr. Vol. 1. Tr. the laſt.

any

any Party to draw up a ſet of Words, as an Article of Faith which they themſelves believe; that their Adverſaries may not alſo fairly ſubſcribe to: ſo on the other hand it is almoſt impoſſible to make ſuch a Confeſſion of Faith, as is not capable of being interpreted into Hereſy. To prove the firſt of theſe aſſertions, let us conſider the diſpute between *Neſtorius* and *Cyril*; about two Natures in one Perſon. Here the word *Perſon* was capable of at leſt *ten* ſenſes, and the word *Nature* of *nine*(*k*). The propoſition therefore might be underſtood in *ninety* different Senſes; and conſequently, there might be *ninety* Subſcribers to the ſame Words, and not *two* of them of the ſame opinion. An inſtance of the latter aſſertion, may be obſerved in the Doctrine of Three Perſons, and One God; which might be interpreted to mean three ſupreme Minds, and be called *Tritheiſtic*; or three unequal Minds, and be called *Arian*; or one ſupreme Mind under *three* denominations; and be called *Sabellian*. Every man therefore is liable to be cenſured as a Heretic, if his Eccleſiaſtical Judge differs from him in Opinion; let his Belief be what it will.

In conſidering all theſe opinions, maintained by ſuch as have been looked upon to be *Orthodox*, we ſee the great difficulty of determining,

(*k*) See Note IV.

where to expect the Truth. "As far as the "Scriptures have determined it; to wit, that "there is a *Father*, a *Son*, and a *Spirit*, and that "there is but *one God*; and that Chriſt is in ſome "places called *God*, and ſaid to be (*ἓν*, *unum*) "one thing with the Father, is agreed to by all "Denominations; whether *Arians*, *Socinians* or "Orthodox. But each of theſe, and many "more, have ſet themſelves to work, to con-"trive a ſcheme to reconcile the difficulty, how "theſe Three are One. Now as the Scriptures "have no way determined this Point; all the "Solutions of it by *One Eſſence*, *One Subſtance*, "*One in Will*, or *Power*; &c. are juſtly to be "looked-upon as ſo many ſeveral Hypotheſes to "ſolve a Phænomenon by(*l*):" and not any *wicked* deſign to blaſpheme or diſhonour God or his Son; but a *pious* intent to explane his Revelation in a conſiſtent manner. And each of them being purely Human, the invention of Men; no Man can have a right to declare his own opinion to be the Doctrine of the Trinity, any more than every other man who differs from him. 'Tis impious and preſumptuous to do it; much leſs has any man a right to accuſe his adverſary, of *denying or oppoſing the ever bleſſed Trinity*; becauſe he rejects as unſcriptural *his* particular Account or Solution. For what one

(*l*) *Sykes* on the External Peace of the Church, p. 18.

Chriſ-

Chriſtian conſiders as a moſt venerable and awful Myſtery; another, equally ſincere, may look upon as no better than Superſtition and Blaſphemy. Did *Athanaſius* deny the Trinity, becauſe he differed from *Origen?* or *Cyril*, becauſe he differed from *Athanaſius?* or *Petavius*, becauſe he differed from *Cyril:* or *Clarke*, *Pearſon*, *How*, *Wallis*, *South*, *Bennet*, *Burnet*, *Sherlock*, &c. becauſe they differed from one another? or *Waterland*, becauſe he formed a ſyſtem different from all that went before him? Surely by no means; every one had a right to underſtand the Doctrine, as he thought was moſt agreeable to Scripture: but not one of them to impoſe his opinion upon other men. And therefore I ſhall not look upon it as a ſufficient argument, that the Hypotheſis of Dr. *Waterland* is the true Orthodox Hypotheſis; merely becauſe it is generally eſpouſed by thoſe, who now call themſelves by that name: but examine it with the ſame liberty that I ſhould take with the ſyſtems of *Origen* or *Cyril*. For if *his* metaphyſical account of the Meſſiah of the Chriſtians, contradicts the deſcription of the Meſſiah which is given by the *Prophets*; it will be incumbent upon Me, either to reject Chriſtianity; or to ſhew, that *his* account is not agreable to the Chriſtian Revelation.

And therefore, I ſhall now conſider the Doctrine of the Trinity, as laid-down by Dr. *Waterland*,

land, and ſeveral other modern writers; who, in many particulars of great moment, differ from one another; All of them from the moſt ancient Fathers, and from the *Nicene* Council, and eſpecially from *Athanaſius*; and yet affect, one and all, to defend their notions under the authority of *His* name.

The *Nicene* Fathers ſuppoſed the Three Perſons in the Trinity to be joined together inſeparably; as the Sun and its Light, the Fountain and its River, the Tree and its Branches: to which was added *Emperichoreſis*(*m*). *Cyril* and others, on the contrary, believed the three Perſon to be *ſeparate* and *diſtinct* Beings; but each of himſelf to be God and Lord(*n*): as *Thomas*, *John* and *William*, are Three ſeparate and diſtinct Men. The *Lateran* Council, contrary to both of theſe opinions, maintained a ſingularity of Subſtance in the Three Perſons; *viz.* That there was but *one* and the *ſame* ſingular Subſtance to them all. Theſe, as I obſerved, were all reckoned Orthodox, at different times; and a fourth Hypotheſis can hardly be conceived. So the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians*, that they may be ſure to be in the right ſomewhere, maintain them all together; though abſolutely contradictory to one another: and the laſt of them is particularly

(*m*) *Cudworth*, 590. (*n*) *Athanaſian* Creed.

con-

condemned by *Athanaſius* himſelf; as being the Doctrine of *Sabellius*(*o*).

This ſyſtem I ſhall the more thoroughly examine, becauſe it is looked upon by many to be the ſtandard of Orthodoxy; and includes in it the great objection to Chriſtianity, which was made to *St. Auguſtine* by *Voluſianus*, *utrum Dominus & Rector Mundi inter Corpuſculum vagientis Infantiæ latet*; *cui parva putatur Univerſitas*: Whether the ſupreme Governor of the World was ſhut-up in the Child Jeſus; of which Dr. *Meric Caſaubon* ſays, in his Opinion it contains an objection againſt Chriſtianity, the moſt conſiderable, in point of credibility that ever was or can be made; and which hath kept more people from embracing the Chriſtian Faith, than any other that he knew of; whereof many inſtances might be given(*p*). And I may add; it is at preſent the chief cauſe of Deiſm in this Country, by rendering the Chriſtian Scriptures utterly unintelligible; and muſt be the moſt unſurmountable obſtacle to the Converſion both of the Jews and Mahometans; as indeed it had long been to Myſelf.

Theſe *Pſeudo-Athanaſians*, as far as I can underſtand them, ſeem to maintain———

1. That the *Logos*, or Word of God; and *that God*, with whom he was in the beginning, and

(*o*) Note VIII. (*p*) Of Credulity and Incredulity, p. 118.

whoſe

whoſe Son he is; and the Holy Spirit, who procedes from them both; are, each of them *ſingly*, the one Supreme God: [whole and intire; though ſome deny this:] and yet the Three *all together* are the ſame One Supreme God.

2. They hold; that the One Supreme God, who is Infinite and conſequently incapable of Local Motion, came down from Heaven. He, that is *Immutable*, quitted the form of God, and took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made Man, i. e. he was joined to a *Soul and Body*; but it was neither the *Father* nor the *Holy Spirit*, that was joined to Man; but only the *Son*: notwithſtanding which, the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt are *inſeparably united*; ſo that the Subſtance of the Son may be juſtly called the Father's Subſtance, being *una ſumma res*(q).

3. They aſſert; that the divine and human Nature, thus joined together, is Chriſt; and that Chriſt ſuffered for Mankind, and yet it was not both the divine and human Nature [or, as the *Athanaſian* Creed expreſſes it, *God and Man which is one Chriſt*] that ſuffered, but only the human Nature; the *divine* Nature, which came down from Heaven, being the Subſtance of the impaſſible ſelf-exiſtent Being; and conſequently *incapable* of ſuffering. Notwithſtanding which, it was the *Supreme* God that ſuf-

(q) Dr. Waterland's defence, 379, 380, 381.

fered;

fered; and the Blood of Chriſt was the Blood of the *Supreme* God; "Supreme in the *ſtricteſt* "ſenſe, God in the ſame ſenſe, and in as *high* "a ſenſe as the Father himſelf;" and received its Worth from being the Blood of *God:* and thereby made ſatisfaction, to the ſame God, for the ſins of the whole World: which it could not have done, had it only been the Blood of *Man*, and not the Blood of *God*. Notwithſtanding which, the Deity ſuffered not at all; being impaſſible. All theſe inſurmountable difficulties they run into, in order to ſupport a notion for which they have no proof; *viz.* That it is impoſſible for God himſelf to create a Being, with power to create inferior Beings; or to give him ſuch power afterwards: or to command a Being, who is not the Supreme God of the Univerſe, to be worſhipped, to the glory of the Supreme God, by thoſe over whom he hath made him Lord and King. Becauſe, ſay they, it would be Idolatry. Thus the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians*, as well as the other Sects, have taken-up their Tenets out of a good deſign; and run into their errors, in order to avoid what they think more derogatory from the honour of God than the principles they profeſs.

Theſe opinions, taken altogether, are not properly a *ſingle* Hereſy; but a *complication* of Hereſies and Contradictions: by means of which the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians* anſwer the objections

which are brought againſt them, ſometimes as *Tritheiſts*, ſometimes as *Sabellians*, ſometimes as *Socinians*, &c.

When it is objected to them that, if Chriſt be the Supreme God, he is not capable of *ſuffering*; and that, to ſuppoſe the Supreme God to ſuffer, is the Hereſy of *Sabellius* and the *Patripaſſians*; they anſwer, that he ſuffered in his *Human* nature only; and the *Divine* nature did not ſuffer at all: which is the ſame thing as to ſay in other words, that it was only a *Man*, or *the Man Jeſus*, that ſuffered; which is the Hereſy of *Socinus* and *Cerinthus*(*r*).

On the other hand, if it be objected; that, to ſuppoſe it to be a mere *Man* that ſuffered, is the Doctrine of *Socinus* and *Cerinthus*; they anſwer, that the Perſon who ſuffered was not a mere Man, but the Second Perſon of the Trinity; and conſequently, the *Supreme God*; which is the Hereſy of *Sabellius* and a direct contradiction to the former anſwer; for, if the Human Nature *only* ſuffered, the Second Perſon of the Trinity *did not* ſuffer; for the *Human* Nature is not the Second Perſon of the Trinity, but the *Divine* nature.

If it be farther objected; that it is *Tritheiſm*, to believe Three Perſons to be *each* of them Supreme God; they anſwer, as the *Sabellians* do,

(*r*) See Lett. VIII. ch. ii. p. 16.

that

that they are *all together* but *One* God. And, on the other hand, if it be objected; that it is *Sabellianism*, to believe the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, to be all together but One God; for as much as ſuch a notion deſtroys the Perſonality of the Son and Holy Ghoſt; they anſwer, *They believe the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are three Diſtinct Perſons, and each of them by himſelf Supreme God*; which is *Tritheiſm*. And if they be preſſed with this objection, that the belief of Three diſtinct Perſons, each of them Supreme God, is Tritheiſm; they anſwer, that theſe Three Perſons, who are *each* of them *ſeparately* Supreme God, are *all together* but *One* God; which is either direct *Sabellianiſm*, in ſuppoſing the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, to be but One Perſon; or elſe a contradiction in terms, in allowing Three Perſons, to be *each of them* a Supreme God, and yet *all together* but one Supreme God.

Thus they abſolve themſelves from one Hereſy; by profeſſing another, which is quite oppoſite to it; and holding two or more Doctrines at the ſame time, which are abſolutely contradictory to each other. And therefore it is no wonder, if they differ as much among themſelves, as they do from their Adverſaries.

Dr. *Waterland* tells us; that God is ſometimes conſidered *perſonally*, with relation and oppoſition to the Son and Holy Ghoſt; and ſometimes

eſſentially, as comprehending the whole Trinity (*s*): but Biſhop *Pearſon*, in oppoſition to this vain diſtinction, (as He calls it,) argues; that, if the Son were included in the Father, then were the Son the Father to himſelf(*t*). They differ no leſs, in their notions of the Generation of the Son(*u*). And Biſhop *Stillingfleet* tells us, the Enemies of the Trinity have mentioned Five Trinities; which he enumerates(*x*): and, in the Second Collection of Unitarian Tracts, mention is made of Forty Particulars; in which the Orthodox differ from one another(*y*).

Theſe Doctrines of the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians* do, in their conſequences, ſtrike at the very fundamental Principles of all natural and reveled Religion; as I ſhall procede to ſhew. But it will be proper in the firſt place to initiate you into the Myſteries of the new invented Metaphyſics, by which they are defended.

It is obvious to the common Senſe of all Mankind; that, if there be any quality or attribute exiſting, as hardneſs, ſoftneſs, goodneſs, righteouſneſs; it muſt belong to, or be the attribute of Something: that is, there muſt be ſome *Thing* or *Being*, that is hard, ſoft, good, or righ-

(*s*) Waterland, 349. quoted in the Reply to Dr. Waterland's defence, p. 438. (*t*) Pearſon on the Creed, p. 32. (*u*) Note VII. (*x*) Note XXI. (*y*) Unitar. Tracts, Vol. ii. p. 8.

teous:

teous: you may call it what you pleaſe, either Subſtratum, Subſtance, Eſſence or Nature; but there muſt be *Something* in which the property exiſts(z). Sir *Iſaac Newton* has expreſſed this Truth very conciſely, as an Axiom; *Virtus ſine Subſtantia ſubſiſtere non poteſt*(a).—Now, if the Subſtance be unintelligent, in which the quality exiſts; we call it a Thing, or *Subſtance*; but if it be intelligent we call it a *Perſon*; meaning by the word *Perſon* to diſtinguiſh a Thing or *Subſtance* that *is* intelligent, from a Thing or *Subſtance* that *is not* intelligent. By the word Perſon, we therefore mean a Thing or Subſtance that is *intelligent*; or a conſcious Being: including in the Word, the Idea both of the Subſtance and its Properties together.

But the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians*, in order to defend their Syſtem, make uſe of the word in ſo many different Senſes; as only ſerves to amaze and confound us. Sometimes, meaning an intelligent Subſtance; at other times, dividing the Subſtance from the Perſon; as when Biſhop *Pearſon* tells us, that Chriſt was buffeted and ſcourged; and no other *Perſon* was ſenſible of thoſe Pains, but the eternal Word; and yet the divine *Eſſence* ſuffered not: And at other times they tell us, that all the artributes of God are really the *ſame*; not only with *themſelves* but with

(z) Note XXIV. (a) Newton's Prin. Schol. Gen. 483.

the

the *Eſſence*(*b*); and that the *Life*, and *Power*, and *Wiſdom* of Chriſt are the *ſame* with his *Eſſence*: and conſequently, the *Perſon* of Chriſt may ſignify either his *Eſſence* or his *Attributes*. But ſuch an uncertain Language can only lead us into confuſion. Nor will theſe arbitrary Metaphyſics, which have no foundation in Scripture or Nature, be ſufficient to ſupport their Theory. For,

1ſt. If the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, be each of them Supreme God, in the higheſt ſenſe of the Word(*c*); as Dr. *Waterland* mainteins: then it follows, that the Son and Holy Spirit are unoriginate and ſelf-exiſtent, as well as the Father; and conſequently, if they are *diſtinct Perſons*, they muſt be three ſelf-exiſtent *Gods*: which is direct *Tritheiſm*. But if they be not diſtinct Perſons, but One Perſon; then the Son and Holy Ghoſt are only different names of the one ſelf-exiſtent Perſon of the Father, and have no real or perſonal Exiſtence of themſelves; which is *Sabellianiſm*.

2dly. But if they be ſuppoſed to be Supreme in the higheſt ſenſe of the word, and yet not ſelf-exiſtent; (which is a contradiction, and yet ſeems

(*b*) *Pearſon* p. 39, and in p. 27. and 137, Notes; and Dr. *Waterland* ſpeaks of the Will of God as God himſelf; as if Will were a real Being. Def. 137. Reply 259.

(*c*) Supreme in the higheſt Senſe, God in the ſame, and in as high a Senſe as the Father himſelf, 53, 57. quoted in the Reply, p. 55. 181.

to

to be the meaning of these Writers;) still there will be Three Supreme Persons, and Three Supreme Governors of the Universe; that is, in other words, Three Gods: whereof One is self-existent and unoriginate, and the other Two not so. And, if they exist in one Substance, (as they suppose,) they will be Three Supreme Gods in one Substance; or, if they exist in Three Substances, they will be Three Supreme Gods in Three Substances. For the Existence of Three Supreme Persons in the One Substance of the Father, (which they suppose,) will no more make them the One Supreme *God*; than it will make them the One Supreme *Father*(*d*). If it does the one, it will do the other.

3dly. All that the *Pseudo-Athanasians* can pretend to conclude, from supposing the Son to be of the same Substance with the Father, is only this; that He is God, *as to his Substance*; but, as they divide the Substance from the Person, and suppose the Person to be originate; it does not at all prove him to be a divine *Person*, or object of Worship. And of this they seem to be conscious. For why do they assert, the Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God; and yet deny, that there are three Gods? The reason is; that, according to their System, they suppose the *Substance* to be *One* and the *same*

(*d*) Reply to Dr. Waterland's defence, 438.

in

in all Three; and the *Godhead* or *Deity* to conſiſt in the *Subſtance*. And therefore a Unity of Subſtance being ſuppoſed, they conclude that theſe Three are One God; becauſe there is only one Eſſence or Subſtance among them—But this will not be the caſe, if they aſſert the *Perſons* to be each of them God; for, on this Suppoſition there would be no Unity at all; each of the Perſons being ſuppoſed a diſtinct and different Perſon, ἄλλη καὶ ἄλλη, as the *Athanaſian* Creed ſays: ſo that the unavoidable conſequence of ſuch an opinion, that each Perſon by *himſelf* is *God* as to his *Perſon*, muſt be a belief of Three Gods(*e*).

Beſides, their argument that Chriſt is not God except his Subſtance be the very *Subſtance* of the Father; if it proves any thing, will prove too much: *viz.* that he is not God in his *Perſon*, except he be the very *Perſon* of the Father. And it is as much Idolatry to worſhip a *Perſon* not ſelf-exiſtent, which they do; as it is to worſhip a *Subſtance* not ſelf-exiſtent, which it is ſaid their Adverſaries do: and conſequently, the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians* are as much Idolaters; in worſhipping the Son and Holy Spirit, whoſe *Perſons*

(*e*) Dr. Waterland, as we find above, page 32, ſays, the Subſtance of one Perſon is not the Subſtance of either of the others; but different, however of the ſame kind. If this be true, there muſt be three diſtinct Gods, becauſe both their Subſtance and Perſons are different; and each of them Supreme.

they

they believe not ſelf-exiſtent; as their Adverſaries are, in worſhipping the ſame Perſons; while they believe their *Subſtances* not ſelf-exiſtent. For if all the Beings in the Univerſe were to exiſt in the divine Subſtance, as the τὸ πᾶν· (as *Lactantius* ſeems to imagine, when he ſays, in *eo ſimul & filius & omnia continentur*;) they would not therefore be *each of them* the *One Supreme God*; but that Perſon or intelligent Being only, whoſe Intelligence and Conſciouſneſs, as well as his Subſtance, is unoriginate and ſelf-exiſtent. For what we worſhip is an *intelligent Being*; It is neither a Nature, nor an Eſſence, nor a Subſtance, nor an Attribute, ſimply conſidered; but a *Perſon*; that is, a Moral Agent; a conſcious *intelligent Subſtance*: and therefore, if we direct our Worſhip to Three Supreme diſtinct Moral Agents or Perſons, or intelligent Beings, we worſhip Three diſtinct Gods; whether their Subſtance be the ſame or not: and the Worſhip of Three diſtinct Supreme Agents, as Governors of the Univerſe, deſtroys the Monarchy of God the Father; and is equally *Tritheiſm*, whether they be ſuppoſed to exiſt in *One* Subſtance or in *Three*.

But if they aſſert the Subſtance and the Attributes to be the *ſame* thing, according to Biſhop *Pearſon*; the matter is full as bad. For as there can be no meaning to the word *Perſon*,

which is not included in the Subſtance and Attributes taken together; if the Subſtance be the *ſame* Thing as the Attributes, then the *Perſon* muſt be included in the Subſtance, *or* the Attributes, taken *ſingly*. And conſequently, if God and Chriſt be of the ſame Subſtance or Attributes, they muſt be the ſame Perſon; which is *Sabellianiſm*.

Or thus: If the *Subſtance* and *Attributes* be the *ſame* Thing, and Chriſt be of the *ſame Subſtance* with the Father: he muſt alſo have the *ſame* Attributes: and conſequently be ſelf-exiſtent and unbegotten. On the contrary, if the Son is begotten, and the Father is of the ſame Subſtance; the Father alſo muſt be begotten, becauſe it is an Attribute of the Son *to be begotten*. And conſequently neither of them is begotten or unbegotten, and there is *neither* Father nor Son; or elſe each of them is *both* Father and Son, begotten and unbegotten.

But farther, if the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians* worſhip the *whole* Chriſt, whom they allow to be both God and Man; they worſhip a compound Being, one part *Originate* and the other *unoriginate*, one *human* and the other *divine*; and therefore, according to their own Principles, are as much guilty of Idolatry, as the *Arians*. And this is the Caſe of all ſuch among them, who worſhip the Chriſt as Mediator; or the Humanity as united to the *Divinity*; of which *Athanaſius*

naſius is one, who, in *Pſalm* 99. 5. explanes *Worſhip ye his foo:ſtool*, to ſignify Worſhip the *human* Nature of Chriſt(*f*). If they worſhip Chriſt as God and Man, they worſhip the Creature as well as the Creator.

The Agreement of the Fathers in this reſpect may be ſeen in *Forbeſii Inſtitut. Theol.* and Dr. *Stilling fleet*'s Defenſe againſt *Godden*. The former of theſe ſcruples not to ſay of Jeſus Chriſt, *Adorandus, inquam, ſine excluſione carnis ab objecto ſeu termino adorationis:* and he ends the Chapter with this concluſion and judgment of the Fathers; *Unica & ſola ratio, propter quam humanitas Chriſti latria ſoli Deo debita, abſque Idolatriæ crimine a nobis colitur, eſt unio Hypoſtatica:* i. e. the only reaſon why we worſhip the human Nature of Chriſt, with that worſhip which is alone due to God, and yet without Idolatry, is the perſonal Union to the Divinity. And thus Dr. *Owen:* "the human Nature, in the Perſon of the divine, and together with it, is the object of all Worſhip and Adoration: and no other Creature."

Thus the *Athanaſians* themſelves worſhip a *Creature*, in the very ſame Act, in which they worſhip the divine Nature. "And it is a vain "thing, ſays Mr. *Emlyn*, to think to excuſe "themſelves by ſaying, they do not worſhip "the Humanity for itſelf; but *as*, and *becauſe*

(*f*) Emlyn's Tracts, p. 107.

" it is united to the Divinity: ſince as that " Union does not change the *human* Nature " into a *divine* Nature, ſo neither does it hinder " their Worſhip from being a Creature-wor- " ſhip(*g*)."

Biſhop *Bull* ſays; " When the Humanity of " Chriſt is adored, the Creature is not ſo " adored, but that the Act reaches to the Crea- " tor, who joined the created Nature to him- " ſelf in the Unity of Perſon." Be it ſo; yet ſtill the *Humanity* is adored, i. e. a *Creature:* and not at all the leſs, becauſe the Creator is adored alſo. And as to the Act *reaching* to the Creator; ſo did the worſhip of God by Images. *Athanaſius* ſays; " Though the Fleſh be of it- " ſelf a part of created things, yet it is made " the Body of God.—We adore not the Crea- " ture; but God, clothed in a created Body." If this be the Caſe, the Mediator is not adored at all; and how does this agree with worſhip- ping the human Nature, as he explanes *Pſalm* 99. 5(*b*).—And ſuppoſe the created Fleſh could be made the Body of God, yet ſtill it would be a *created* Body; and the Worſhip of it, the Worſhip of a *creature.*

A fourth Objection to this amazing notion, that the *Meſſiah is the Supreme God,* is this: that it makes him *incapable* of performing thoſe

(*g*) Emlyn's Tracts, p. 107. (*b*) Bulli op. pa. 57.

Actions,

Actions, and undergoing thoſe Sufferings; which are foretold in our Prophecies, and recorded in the New Teſtament, to be actually performed and undergone by him; contradicting all thoſe Texts of Scripture, which declare him to be *ſent* by the Father to do his will, as He gave him Commandment; and that he *ſuffered* and *died*, and *was rewarded*. For if the Subſtance of the Son be the ſelf-exiſtent Subſtance of the Father, (in which the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians* imagine the Godhead or Divinity to conſiſt;) then the Son was not capable of coming into the World, or being ſent: for how can that Subſtance be capable of moving from one place to another, which fills all ſpace at the ſame time? Much leſs can he be capable of Incarnation: for nothing can be more abſurd, than to imagine that Subſtance, which the Heaven of Heavens cannot contain, to be confined in the human Body; and yet *Juſtin Martyr* tells us planely the Doctrine of his age, *viz.* That he came down from Heaven; that he might be born Man of the Virgin *Mary*(*i*). And if He were only a part of the divine Subſtance, which was the Notion of *Tertullian* and the *Montaniſts*; then the ſelf-exiſtent Subſtance muſt be divided: which is contrary to the *Pſeudo-Athanaſian* ſyſtem.

(*i*) Dial. 2, p. 378, Lon. Ed.

If

If it be ſaid; that it was not the *Subſtance*, but only the *Perſon* of the Son which was Incarnate; (as if the Perſon could be ſeparate from the Subſtance:) then it follows, upon the *Pſeudo-Athanaſian* Theory, that the *Perſon* who was Incarnate was *not God*; for they confine the *Divinity* to the *Subſtance* or *Eſſence*. And as Chriſt could not be ſent by the Father, nor be Incarnate; if he were God, of the *ſame identical* Subſtance with the Father; becauſe the infinite Subſtance is incapable of local motion and confinement: So neither could he ſuffer and die, and be rewarded. But all theſe things are predicated of Chriſt, in the Chriſtian Scriptures; and yet not one of them can, without Blaſphemy, be predicated of God the Father of the Univerſe; who is incapable of them: and conſequently, the Chriſtian Scriptures cannot admit of this Doctrine; that Chriſt is the *Supreme God*.

To obviate this difficulty in ſome meaſure, it is ſaid: that Chriſt is *both* the Supreme God, and *alſo* Man; that in him God and Man were *united*. So that he had *two* Natures in *one* Perſon; the *divine* Nature, as God; and the *human* Nature, as Man; the one impaſſible, the other paſſible; and therefore, though he could not ſuffer, *as God*; he was capable of ſuffering, *as Man*.

This

This notion, though now held by many; yet when thoroughly examined, will appear to agree entirely with the Hereſies of *Cerinthus* and *Socinus*, in the main point; *viz.* That no other Being ſuffered, but a *mere Man*. For though the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians* do not now ſay with *Cerinthus*, that the divine Perſon who deſcended from Heaven left the Man *Jeſus* before his Paſſion; nor with *Socinus*, that Chriſt was a *mere Man*; yet they agree with both, that the ſufferings were not *undergone*, i. e. were not *felt*, by that divine Being who came down from Heaven; whom they ſuppoſe to be *impaſſible:* And conſequently no other Being ſuffered but a Man.

To extricate themſelves from this difficulty, it was ſaid by *Hilary*; that he *ſuffered*, but was *inſenſible of Pain*(*k*). But this is a palpable contradiction: for without a ſenſe of Pain there can be no Suffering. And therefore it was thought more proper to ſay, that Chriſt ſuffered in the *human* Nature only; which is an expreſſion not ſo eaſily ſeen through, but in fact the ſame thing: For it ſuppoſes the Perſon who came down from Heaven, to ſuffer in ſuch a manner; that the ſenſation of pain fell only upon the *human* Nature: which was *not* the Perſon that came down from Heaven, but a *mere Man*. For *Nature*, in the ſtricteſt ſenſe

(*k*) See Note XXV.

of

of the Word, is only an abſtract Idea; and incapable of ſuffering, as having no perſonal Exiſtence. Now Biſhop *Pearſon* ſays, "When he "(Chriſt) ſat down weary by the Well, there "was *no other* Perſon felt the thirſt, but *he* that "was *eternally* begotten of the Father, the "Fountain of the Deity. When he was buf-"fetted and ſcourged, there was *no other* Per-"ſon ſenſible of thoſe pains than the *eternal* "*Word* which before all worlds was impaſſi-"ble(*l*)." But all this is mere ſophiſtry, fallacy, and deluſion; for at the ſame time he tells us, the ſenſe of Pain fell only upon the *human* Nature; i. e. the Man: for he ſays; "the ſufferings of Chriſt were not the ſufferings "of his *Deity*, of which *that* was *incapable*; "but of his *Humanity*, unto which *that* was *in-*"*clinable:* for the divine Eſſence ſuffered "not(*m*):"—Here then his Lordſhip ſuppoſes the Son of God to ſuffer in ſuch a manner, as that the ſenſe of the pain fell only upon the *human nature*; but the human nature could not be the *Eternal Word*; but a *mere Man*. Thus in words He avoids the error of *Cerinthus*, by ſuppoſing the divine Being did not leave Jeſus at his Paſſion; but agrees with him in that he

(*l*) Pearſon on the Creed. p. 186. (*m*) The Expreſſion the fountain of the Deity, does not relate to the Son but to the Father; the Author miſtook Bp. Pearſon in the firſt Edition.

does

does λύειν τὸν Χριστὸν, divide Chriſt into two parts, the *divine* and *human* Nature; and ſuppoſes the ſufferings to be undergone by a mere Man.

Now this notion, that the human Soul only ſuffered, deſtroys the fundamental Principle of Chriſtianity: and there is no foundation for it in the Scripture. What we read there is; that the *Word* was made Fleſh, and dwelt among us (*n*): That God prepared him a Body(*o*). That he was conceived in the Womb of the Virgin *Mary*(*p*) and born of Her(*q*). But that there was any other *Perſon* or conſcious Being, who dwelt in that body, beſides the *Word* which came down from Heaven; is no where ſaid in the New Teſtament: and is founded merely upon a miſunderſtanding of the Hebrew Idiom in the Goſpels, where Chriſt is called a *Man*, and his *Soul* and *Spirit* are ſpoken of. From whence the Chriſtians have imagined him to be compounded, not of two Natures only, but of three or four; for, according to the Determination of the Council of *Alexandria* againſt *Apollinaris*, Chriſt conſiſted of a *Soul*, and a *Spirit*, and a *Body*; beſides the *divine* Nature. But this is all a miſtaken Notion: For the Word *Man*, when uſed in the Scriptures with regard to ſuperior Beings appearing in a human Form, never ſuppoſes them to be animated by a human Soul;

(*n*) Pearſon on the Creed, p. 187. 188. (*o*) Jo. i. 14. (*p*) Heb. x. 5. (*q*) Lu. i. 31.

but only by *that* ſuperior conſcious Being or Perſon. And in this Senſe the Word Man is uſed by *Juſtin Martyr*; when he ſays, that *Chriſt* was an Angel, and God, and Lord, and a *Man*, Ἀνὴρ; and the *Man*, Ἄνθρωπος, that appeared to *Abraham* and *Iſaac*, and to *Moſes*(*r*). And ſo *Daniel* calls the Angel *Gabriel* a Man(*s*).

Thus it is ſaid, *Gen.* xxxii. 24. "And there "wreſtled with him *(Jacob)* a *Man*, until the "breaking of the Day:" And this *Man* was an Angel in a human Form; as appears by Verſe the 30th. In like Manner, the three *Men* who appeared to *Abraham*, in the Plains of *Mamre*, were three Angels; and yet appeared as *Men*(*t*). And ſo the fourth *Man*, that was ſeen by *Nebuchadnezzar* in the fiery Furnace, is always underſtood to have been an Angel(*u*). So alſo, the Angel that appeared to *Joſhua* was as a *Man*(*x*): and *Joſhua* addreſſed him as a real Man; and knew him for no other, till he diſcovered himſelf to him. So alſo, the Angel appeared as a *Man* to *Manoah*; who knew not that he was an Angel of the Lord, till he had aſcended in the Flame of the Altar(*y*). And we find the ſame Language in the New Teſtament; where we are told, that at the Reſurrection of *Jeſus*, they ſaw a young *Man* ſitting at the right Side

(*r*) Ed. Lon. p. 262. (*s*) Dan. ix. 31. (*t*) Gen. xviii. (*u*) Dan. iii. 25. (*x*) Joſ. v. 13. 15. (*y*) Jud. xiii. 11. 16. 21.

of

of the Sepulchre, clothed in a long white Garment; at which they were affrighted (*z*): and, at his Aſcenſion, two *Men* ſtood by them, in white Apparel (*a*). All theſe Appearances were of Angels, in the Form of *Men*; yet none of theſe were ever ſuppoſed to be animated by a human Soul; but only by their own *angelical* Perſons. Why then ſhould we underſtand St. *Paul* in another Senſe; when he tells us, "The ſecond *Man* was the Lord from Heaven (*b*)?" There is certainly no Difference once hinted at in the Scriptures; nor can the leſt Reaſon be given, why a human Soul ſhould be introduced. Can it be thought neceſſary, that a Soul ſhould be created; merely that the Angels ſhould deliver a Meſſage, which they could as well deliver without it? The *Body* might afterwards be reſolved into its conſtituent Parts; but a *Soul* is of a ſuperior Nature, and can never be ſuppoſed to be formed for ſuch an immediate Diſſolution or Annihilation.

This doctrine of *Apollinaris*, viz. That the *Logos*, or divine Perſon, which deſcended from Heaven, ſupplied the place of a *Soul* in *Chriſt*, is plain and intelligible; and anſwers much better than any other to the Texts which aſſert, that *Chriſt took on him the Seed of Abraham*; was made in the Likeneſs of *Men*; God was mani-

(*z*) Mar. xvi. 5. (*a*) Acts i. 10. (*b*) Cor. xv. 47.

feſt in the *Fleſh*; came in the *Fleſh*; in the Likeneſs of ſinful *Fleſh*; in him dwelleth the Fullneſs of the Godhead; the Word was made *Fleſh*; was incarnate. "All theſe Texts of Scripture "are, upon the *Apollinarian* Scheme, natural, "plain, and eaſy: It teaches a moſt proper "Unity of Perſon; as making the God-Man "*Jeſus Chriſt* to be ſtrictly one intelligent "Agent (*c*):" It makes the very *ſame* Perſon ſuffer and die, that *came down* from Heaven; which is the fundamental Article of the Chriſtian Religion.

And Mr. *Whiſton* ſays; "The Scripture, "and earlieſt Antiquity, never affirm, that *Chriſt* "took a *human rational* Soul; they never ſay, "he took a *whole human nature*; never ſay, he "was in that Senſe a true and perfect Man: "But that he was made *Fleſh*; had a *Body* pre-"pared for him; was the *Word*, or a God in-"carnate; was made in the *Likeneſs* of Men; "was found in *Faſhion* as a Man, while he was "*God* the *Word*. Nay, *Ignatius* directly affirms; "that it was the *Word*, and *not* a human Soul, "which inhabited in that Body: And almoſt "all the Ancients agree in the ſame Doctrine; "even *Athanaſius* himſelf, before the Council "of *Nice*(*d*).

(*c*) Sykes on the External Peace of the Church, 29, 30.
(*d*) Whiſton's Account of the Convocation's proceding againſt him, 87.

And

And notwithſtanding the pains that were taken to diſcourage it, it appeared again, in different ſhapes in the *Chriſtian* Church, in the Doctrine of the *Monothelites*; who held, that *Chriſt* had only *one Will*; which without doubt is ſufficient for *one Perſon*. And in the *Jewiſh* church the ſame notion appeared among the cabaliſtic *Jews*, who looked upon the Angel *Metatron*, who they ſay inſtructed *Moſes*, to be the Soul of the *Meſſiah*(*e*). And this Angel they ſuppoſed to be the Angel of the Covenant, or the Angel of God, or the Viſible *Jehovah*; who appeared to the Patriarchs in a human form. Why then ſhould the Chriſtians imagine; that, when Chriſt is called a *Man* in their Scriptures, it has any other meaning; than when the Angel of the Covenant, or any other Angel, is called a *Man* in the writings of *Moſes?*

But as this opinion may perhaps be looked upon to be *new*; and ſo concluded to be *falſe*, without farther examination; I muſt be obliged to expatiate a little here, in order to prove its Antiquity; For there are many men, who hate Novelty as much as Falſity; or at leſt look upon the former, as a certain proof of the latter. Now this opinion is ſpoken-of ſo early as in the Epiſtle of *Ignatius* to the *Philadelphians*; in which, among other doctrines that he mentions as falſe,

(*e*) Allix on the Jewiſh Church, 456.

this

this is one; *viz.* that there was not in Chriſt a human Soul, but the Soul was ſupplied by the *Logos*(*f*). From hence it would appear, if the Epiſtle was allowed to be genuine, that this notion was extremely antient: for *Ignatius* was Biſhop of *Alexandria* about the year 70. But the authority of it is doubted; and this very doctrine is given as a reaſon of that doubt. For we are told; that "in the Epiſtle to the *Philadelphians*, mention is made of this Hereſy, "that there was in Chriſt no human ſoul; yet "was *Apollinaris Laodicenus* the firſt author "thereof, who lived about the year 370(*g*)." And beſides it is obſerved that this Epiſtle is never quoted by any of the Ancients; nor was ever heard-of in the world before *Ado Viennenſis*; who flouriſhed about the year 859(*h*). If this be the caſe, it ſhews; that thoſe who foiſted it into this Epiſtle, wanted the authority of *Ignatius* to make it thought an error; but it does not appear, that it was ever looked-upon in that light till condemned by the Council of *Alexandria*, near 300 years after, in 362; and *Apollinaris* by name, in 381.

But we are referred to *Apollinaris*; and told, that he is the Firſt who maintained this doctrine; and the Author of it. Probably, it was never diſputed before his time; becauſe it

(*f*) Note XXVI. (*g*) Ἀρχαιοσκοπία, by J. Hanmer, p. 8. (*h*) Unit. Tracts, Vol. 2. Tract 3. p. 16.

was

was never before queſtioned, but was conſidered as the genuine doctrine of the Apoſtles; for it is held by all thoſe, who are called *Jacobites*, and received their doctrines immediately from St. *James*; and, as others ſay, were converted by St. *Matthew*. Theſe teach, with *Arius* and *Apollinaris*; that the *Word* hath a nature liable to change, and took Fleſh *without* a Soul; and that the Body of the Lord hath not a Mind [*mentem*]; but the *Word* ſupplies its place; and theſe are extremely numerous in *Aſia*. So that this doctrine is neither to be looked-upon as a private opinion of the *Arians*, nor of a late date; and all the Chriſtian world was once of this perſuaſion(*i*).

As long as the genius of the *Hebrew* language was well explaned by the converted *Jews*; the Chriſt, and the Soul and Spirit of Chriſt, were underſtood to ſignify the ſame thing as Chriſt himſelf; agreable to our own Scriptures, even when ſpeaking of *Jehovah* himſelf. Thus we find in the Old Teſtament; Haſt thou utterly rejected us? Hath thy *Soul* loathed *Sion*(*k*)? your new-moons, and your appointed feaſts, my *Soul* hateth(*l*). Behold my ſervant, whom I uphold; mine Elect, in whom my *Soul* delighteth(*m*), &c. And in the ſame ſenſe the

(*i*) Sandii Nuc. pa. 101.—See below a quotation from Sandius, in Note IX. p. 97. (*k*) Jer. xiv. 19. (*l*) Iſ. i. 14. (*m*) Iſ. xlii. i. v. 9.

word

word Spirit is uſed: My *Spirit* ſhall not always ſtrive with Men(*n*). And St. *Paul* uſes the ſame language: What man knoweth the things of a man, but the *Spirit* of man that is in him(*o*); that is, the *Man himſelf*. Even ſo, the things of God knoweth no man, but the *Spirit* of God; that is, *God himſelf*(*p*). So the Spirit of *Chriſt*, the Spirit of *Paul*, the Spirit of the *Medes*, ſignifies their Perſons; and the Spirit of Burning, of Counſel, of Grace, &c. ſignifies the Things themſelves. It is true, there are but few texts; in which we can be certain, whether the expreſſion *the Spirit of God*, be mean'd of the *Perſon* of God the Father; or of the *Third Perſon* of the Trinity, which is called the Holy Spirit: however, one or two are ſufficient for my purpoſe; eſpecially as the word Soul is ſo frequently uſed of God the Father, and is ſubject to no ſuch equivoque. And it is very remarkable; that *Lucian*, who ſuffered Martyrdom at *Nicomedia*, and underſtood the *Hebrew* language ſo well that he tranſlated the Scripture out of *Hebrew* into *Greek*; was of the ſame opinion, in this reſpect, with *Apollinaris*; in denying that Chriſt had any other Soul than the *Logos*(*q*).

But when by the deciſions of the Councils, which made the Son of God equal to his own

(*n*) Gen. vi 3. (*o*) 1 Cor. ii. 11. (*p*) Rom. viii. 9. (*q*) Epiph. in Ancor. §. 35. Sandius 210.

Father;

Father; the *Jews* were no longer capable of being converted to a Religion, which appeared to contradict the firſt Commandment of the Law; Chriſtianity loſt one of its chiefeſt ſupports, by loſing the knowledge of the *Hebrew* Language; which, during many ages, few of the learned Chriſtians underſtood(*r*): ſo that when they met with ſuch expreſſions as theſe which are uſed of Chriſt, My *Soul* is exceding ſorrowful(*s*); Father, into thy hand I commend my *Spirit*(*t*); they miſtook the ſenſe of the Idiom, and imagined that the Words *Soul* and *Spirit* were meaned to expreſs ſomething different from Chriſt himſelf: not conſidering, that, by the ſame interpretation, they muſt ſuppoſe a Soul, and a Spirit, and a Divinity, in the Self-exiſtent *Jehovah*; who is abſolutely ſimple and uncompounded(*u*).

But the Council of *Alexandria* not obſerving the *Hebrew* idiom in theſe words, and having authority from the New Teſtament, to ſpeak not only of the *Word* of God, but alſo of his *Soul* and *Spirit*; declared, in oppoſition to *Apollinaris*, though they did not mention him by Name; that Chriſt had a Soul, and a Body, and a Spirit: and condemned his opinion as heretical. But whether *Apollinaris* had the truth on his ſide, or the Council that con-

(*r*) Note XXVII. (*s*) *Mark* xiv. 34. (*t*) *Luke* xxiii. 46. (*u*) Note XXVIII.

demned him, ſtill continues a queſtion. Perhaps, if we conſider the *Man*, and his *communication*; and how little can be ſaid againſt him by thoſe, who were moſt willing to condemn him; we ſhall be apt to believe his opinion *orthodox*, in the *true* ſenſe of the word; and that the Council that condemned him were the Heretics. I refer you to the Note, for ſatisfaction in this particular; as it would make too long a digreſſion in the Text(*x*).

Now, ſince the words *Soul* and *Spirit*, when ſpoken of Chriſt, are only different phraſes to expreſs the ſame Perſon of Chriſt; and not the different Parts, of which he was compounded; the doctrine which conſiders Chriſt as two or three conſcious Beings united, ſometimes as God and ſometimes as Man, knowing a thing as God, and ignorant of it as a Man, cannot be proved from Scripture: and conſequently, the notion founded upon it, that the human nature of Chriſt ſuffered, but the Divine Nature was impaſſible, is without ſufficient foundation to ſupport it.

"*John* (ſays *Irenæus*) knew but *one* and the "*ſame* perſon; who was the *Word* of God, and "the only Begotten, and was incarnate for "man's ſalvation; Jeſus Chriſt, our Lord(*y*)." —And again, "Let us not think, that Jeſus is

(*x*) Note XVIII. (*y*) *Irenæus*, l. iii. c. 18. p. 242. Reply to Dr. Waterland's defence, p. 42.

"*one*

" *one* perſon, and Chriſt *another* perſon; but " know, that they are both one and the ſame " perſon."—And again, " *Paul*, ſays he, knew " nothing of that Chriſt, which *departed* from " Jeſus; nor of that Saviour, who they ſay was " *impaſſible*: For, if it was *one* perſon that ſuf- " fered, and *another* that remained impaſſible; " *one* perſon that was born, and *another* that " deſcended upon him that was born, and left " him again (at his Paſſion); then there is not " *one*, but *two* perſons(z)."—Again, " Jeſus, " that ſuffered for us, is that very perſon who " was the Word of God(a).—The Word of " God was made Fleſh, and ſuffered.—If Chriſt " did not *really* ſuffer; no thanks are due to " him, who ſuffered nothing for us."—The Apoſtolic Conſtitutions ſay; " He (God the " Father) condeſcended that his Beloved, the " Divine Word, who was by nature impaſſible, " ſhould ſuffer for us: and *Hippolytus* ſays, the " impaſſible Word of God ſubmitted to ſuffer."

What I mean by theſe quotations from the Fathers, is only to ſhew; that the opinion I am defending is the old original Faith of the antient Writers: and that, in their days, the notion of *two* Perſons in Chriſt, or, which is the ſame thing, *two* Natures, the one paſſible, the other impaſſible, was Heretical: which of

(z) Ib. 242. (a) Ib. 42.

them is the true opinion, is another queſtion; and muſt be determined by Scripture.

And nothing is more manifeſt in the New Teſtament; than that it always conſiders the Chriſt that *came down* from Heaven, the Chriſt *born* of the Virgin, and the Chriſt that *ſuffered*, as the *ſame* individual perſon; and never ſpeaks of Chriſt, as divided; or of one part of Chriſt, as acting diſtinct and ſeparate from another: But declares; "Every ſpirit which divideth "Jeſus, is not of God." 1 *John*, iv. 3(*b*). It never tells us, the Meſſiah who was called Chriſt, differed from the Meſſiah that *Iſaiah* tells us was to ſuffer; or the Chriſt who came down from Heaven, differed from the Chriſt that died: But the Chriſt by whom God *made the worlds*, is repreſented as the very *ſame perſon* who *purged our ſins*, and whom God hath appointed *Heir of all things*; and it was the *ſame* Perſon that *humbled* himſelf, who became obedient to Death. But, if the Divine Nature did not ſuffer; where was the *Humiliation?* And when St. *Paul* proved, that "Jeſus was "the Chriſt(*c*);" he proved, that they were *one* and the *ſame* perſon; for there can be no other meaning to the words. "Jeſus knew

(*b*) Many antient Copies read it ſo. *Irenæus*, lib. iii. c. 18. *Cerinthus* did λύειν Ἰησοῦν divide Chriſt into two perſons. Reply to Dr. *Waterland*, p. 41. (*c*) Acts xviii. 28.

"that

"that *he* (i. e. himſelf, the very ſame perſon, "ſubſtance, and nature) came from God, and "went to God(*d*)." I came from the Father, ſays he; and am come into the world: Again, I, the very ſame perſon that came from the Father, leave the world; and go to the Father(*e*): It was the Son of Man that aſcended up where He was before(*f*); He that *deſcended* was the ſame (perſon) alſo that *aſcended* up far above all Heavens, that he might fill all things(*g*): The ſame Word, that was in the beginning with God, and made all Things, was made Fleſh(*h*): The Child that was born of the Virgin, was *Emanuel*; or *God with us*(*i*).

We are told by St. *Paul*, that Chriſt gave *himſelf* for us(*k*); that he gave *himſelf* for the Church(*l*); that he gave *himſelf* a ranſom for all(*m*); who being the brightneſs of his (the Father's) glory, and the expreſs image of his Perſon, when he had, by *himſelf*, purged our ſins, ſat down at the right hand of the Majeſty on High(*n*): It was *himſelf* that took Fleſh(*o*); and *himſelf* that ſuffered(*p*). From all theſe Texts, nothing is more plane than this; that it was Chriſt *himſelf* that was given for us, and

(*d*) John xiii. 3. (*e*) John xvi. 28. (*f*) John vi. 62. (*g*) Eph. iv. 10. (*h*) John i. 2. 14. (*i*) Mat. i. 23. (*k*) Eph. v. 2. (*l*) Ib. 25. (*m*) 1 Tim. ii. 6. (*n*) Heb. i. 3. (*o*) Heb. ii. 14. (*p*) Ib. 18. ix. 26.

ſuffered,

ſuffered, and died; and not a *Part of himſelf* only. If ſuch an unaccountable Senſe, as that of a *Half Self*, had been the true meaning of the Texts; it would certainly have been ſo explaned: ſuch a Senſe having never been heard of before; nor intelligible, ever ſince it was firſt invented: For was the Divine nature Chriſt *himſelf*, or was the Human nature Chriſt *himſelf?* or had he a double Self; one of which ſuffered, and the other did not? or will the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians* tell us, that *two Selves* are joined in one Perſon; as they ſay two *Natures* are? God has reveled to us a plane and intelligible doctrine; that the Divine Being, by whom he created us, came down from Heaven, and underwent Sufferings and Death for our Salvation: and the Chriſtians have made it abſolutely unintelligible, by their Refinements. For whereas there is not the leſt intimation through the whole Scripture, that by the words *Meſſiah*, *the Chriſt*, *the Son of Man*, *Jeſus Chriſt*, the *Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, the *Son of God*, *the Savior*, *Himſelf*, &c. is ever mean'd only *a Part* of the Meſſiah, a Part of Chriſt, a Part of the Son of Man, a Part of Himſelf, &c. and ſometimes *one* part, and ſometimes *another*; ſo that ſometimes *one* thing is ſaid of him, and ſometimes the *direct contrary:* Can any thing be a greater proof than this, that ſome Chriſtians have miſtaken the *nature* of that Being? or, Can there be a better proof, that others have a

right

right opinion of him, than by underſtanding the nature of his perſon in ſuch a manner, as to render all the expreſſions in the Scripture which relate to him, plane and intelligible; in the ſame ſenſe always, and in the natural and literal meaning; *viz.* That the *ſame perſon*, who was born into the world, in the days of *Herod*, and ſuffered and died; was alſo before *Abraham*, and *Abraham* ſaw his day; and that the *ſame perſon*, who preached by the Spirit, in the days of *Noah*; preached alſo to Mankind, in the reign of *Tiberius Cæſar?* To make them two diſtinct Perſons, is to contradict the Scripture; which declares them to be *One* and the *ſame* Perſon: and to ſuppoſe the One Perſon which ſuffered, to be at the ſame time *impaſſible*, is to contradict the common ſenſe and reaſon of Mankind; ſo far as to make the Revelation unintelligible and uſeleſs.

Again the Scripture mentions it as the higheſt inſtance of the love of God to Man; that he ſpared not his own Son, but freely gave him up for us all. But how inconſiſtent is this with the notion, that this ſupremacy of love conſiſted in the death of a *mere Man*; which thoſe Chriſtians are obliged to maintain, who believe Chriſt to be the *Supreme God?* Thoſe very Chriſtians, I ſay, who pretend to have the higheſt ſentiments of Chriſt, and therefore exalt him to an equality with the Father; when they come to

conſider

conſider his Death, that grand event, in which the infinite love of God was manifeſted to Mankind; find it impoſſible for them to maintain, that the Supreme God ſuffered and died: and are therefore forced to explane this *infinity of love* to conſiſt in the death and ſufferings of a mere Man; thereby reducing him too *low*, as they had before exalted him too *high*, to be conſiſtent with Scripture: For the Scripture declares the *Sufferer* to be the *Chriſt*; and the *Chriſt* to be the *very Perſon*, i. e. the *ſame intelligent Subſtance*, that came down from Heaven; and came not of himſelf, but the *Father ſent* him. And *Iſaiah* tells us, it was the *ſame Perſon* whom God would ſend, and would pleaſe to bruiſe and put to grief, that made his Soul an offering for ſin, and poured out his Soul unto Death, and was rewarded, and divided the ſpoil with the ſtrong(*q*). So that there is no more room, from the Scripture, for any ſuch imagination, as that of *two intelligent Natures* in Chriſt; the one human, the other divine; the one paſſible, the other impaſſible; than to believe, there were *two Meſſiahs*; the one of them to ſuffer, and the other to be triumphant; the one the Son of David, and the other the Son of *Joſeph* of *Ephraim* (*r*): for Chriſt is always ſpoken of, both in the Old and New Teſtament, as *one* and the *ſame* Perſon.

(*q*) Iſ. liii. 10, 11, 12. (*r*) Lett. IV. 182.

But

But in direct oppoſition to this fundamental Article of Chriſtianity; that the Son of God, *who came down from Heaven*, was the *ſame* Perſon who *ſuffered death* upon the Croſs; Biſhop *Pearſon* ſays in ſupport of his own Hypotheſis, as follows: "We muſt not think ſo *low* of the *Eſſence* of the "Word; as to think it *ſubject* to the ſufferings "of the Fleſh (*s*):" And again, "the ſuffer-"ings of Chriſt were not the ſufferings of his "*Deity*, of which *that* was *incapable*; but of his "*Humanity*, as unto which *that* was *inclinable*: "for the Divine Eſſence ſuffered not(*t*)." Thus the antient Chriſtians argued upon Chriſt's weeping over *Jeruſalem*, [*quaſi fletus Chriſto non conveniret*,] that it was not agreable to his Character; upon which, they ſtruck it out of their Copies(*u*). But his Lordſhip muſt diſtinguiſh very nicely; if he ſuppoſes it *below* the Dignity of the divine Nature of Chriſt, to *die*; and yet *not below* it, to be *born* of a Woman; and *live* in this World, ſubjected to the indignities which he received: for in truth no humiliation could be improper to be undertaken by any originate Being; which God ſhould think proper to appoint him. By this method of reaſoning, the Biſhop falls into the very error which he combats with ſo much zele; even the Hereſy of *Socinus*, *Paul* of *Samoſata*, and *Artemas*: for, if nothing ſuffered but

(*s*) Pearſon, p. 147. (*t*) Ib. 188. (*u*) Poli Synop. Vol. iv. p. 1190.

the *human* nature, no other perſon ſuffered but a *mortal Man*.

By this we ſee; that the ſufferings of that Perſon who came down from Heaven, which was to the *Jews* a ſtumbling-block, and to the *Greeks* fooliſhneſs; is ſtill conſidered by the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians* in the ſame light: for which reaſon, though they allow it in *words*, yet they deny it in *fact*. But after all the ſophiſtry uſed to diſguiſe the Truth, it is infallibly certain; that, when God is ſaid *to ſuffer* in the nature of Man, yet if God himſelf does not feel the pain, but Man only, it is the *Man alone that ſuffers*.

And yet, what is ſtill more amazing; though his Lordſhip declares, that nothing ſuffered but the *Human* Nature, or a mere man; he lays the whole merit of Chriſt's ſufferings upon their being the ſufferings of *God*. I ſhall quote the Biſhop's words, as being a perſon every way reſpectable; to ſhew the modern opinion on this point.

" We know," ſays the Biſhop, " that it is " impoſſible for the Blood of bulls and goats to " take away Sins; and we may well doubt, " how the Blood of him, that hath no other " nature than that of Man, can take away the " ſins of other Men; there appearing no ſuch " difference, as will ſhew a Certainty of the one, " and an Impoſſibility of the other: But ſince " we may be bought with a Price, well may we " believe the Blood of *Chriſt* ſufficiently pre-

" cious;

" cious; when we are aſſured, that it is the Blood " *of God*(*x*)."

This Argument is founded upon a notion, no leſs derogatory from the honour of God, than full of confuſion in itſelf; *viz.* That God *could not* forgive the ſins of Men, without an adequate and equivalent Satisfaction paid to his Juſtice; and that this could only be done by the Sufferings, and Death of Chriſt, who is the Supreme God: no other Satisfaction being *equivalent to the debt*. And therefore He *himſelf* ſuffered and died; and thereby ſatisfied *His own* juſtice and wrath againſt the ſins of Men; and forgave them *freely*, upon receiving *full ſatisfaction* and payment. Or thus, in other words: The *Second* Perſon of the Trinity ſuffered, in order to ſatisfy the wrath of the *Firſt* Perſon in the Trinity, for the ſins of Men; which *Firſt* Perſon, who *required* the ſatisfaction, is the *ſame* God as the *Second* Perſon, who *paid* it. The true Scripture Doctrine upon this Subject ſhall be hereafter explained; agreable to Reaſon, and the common Principles of mankind; I ſhall only conſider, at

(*x*) *Pearſon*, p. 142. The learned and ingenious Mr. Lindſey quotes from Wetſtein, in a note on Acts xx. 28, theſe words of Athanaſius againſt Apollinaris; " the " Scriptures, as we read them, never uſe ſuch expreſſions " as the *bloud of God:* Such daring flights we leave to " the Arians." Second part of his apology, p. 202. Have our orthodox writers any better authority to take ſuch daring flights than Athanaſius or Arius?

preſent; whether the Blood ſpill'd was the Blood of the *Supreme* God, as his Lordſhip ſuppoſes.

Now, according to this Notion and Argument, if the Blood of *Chriſt* be not the Blood of *God*, not only in *word*, but in *fact*; it follows, that we may doubt how *his* Blood could *take away Sins*; when the Blood of bulls and goats *could not*. And yet the Biſhop allows, that the Supreme God is not capable of Sufferings and Death; and ſays, that the Divine Nature of Chriſt ſuffered as little, as if it had not been conjoined to the Human Nature. From all which it inevitably follows; that, if Chriſt be the Supreme God, then either the Supreme God is *capable* of Sufferings, and *did ſuffer*; or elſe, that the Blood of Chriſt *did not* take away Sin: a very raſh and falſe Dilemma.

And now, ſays the Biſhop, the only difficulty will conſiſt in this: "How we can ſay, that *God* "*did ſuffer*; when we profeſs the *Godhead ſuffered* "*not* (*y*):" or, as he expreſſes it in another place, "the *Divine* Nature ſuffered not; but "the *Human* Nature only(*z*)." And this, he ſays, will meet with an eaſy Solution; if we conſider the *intimate conjunction* of the divine and human Nature, and their union in the Perſon of the Son; for hereby thoſe Attributes, which *properly belong* to the *one*, are given to the *other*.

(*y*) *Pearſon*, p. 188. (*z*) Ib. 192.

But

But this is not *true*; and does not anſwer the difficulty. For, in the firſt place, *Nature* is a mere abſtract idea, and *incapable* of Suffering; whether it be divine or human: nothing can ſuffer, but a *Perſon*; that is, a living intelligent *Subſtance*, or *Agent*; a *Property*, or number of properties, (in which the Nature of every Being conſiſts,) is *incapable* of it; and conſequently, if it be ſaid, two Natures are united in one Perſon, neither of theſe Natures can ſuffer; but only the Perſon, or intelligent conſcious Being, to whom it belongs. If the *Perſon* does not ſuffer, there can be no ſuffering undergone; for to ſuppoſe ſuffering, and no perſon to ſuffer, is a contradiction. Biſhop *Fowler* ſays; "I do believe the Redemption of Mankind to be the "Redemption of the particular *Men* of all Mankind: nor can I underſtand, what the Redemption of *human Nature* can ſignify; in any "other ſenſe: I could never tell, where univerſal Nature exiſts; but in the fineſt head-pieces "of Metaphyſicians(*a*)." Therefore, if Chriſt be the Supreme God; the Perſon of the Supreme God did ſuffer, or it did not. If it be allowed, that he *did not ſuffer*; the queſtion is given-up: and no other Being ſuffered, but a mortal Man; which the Biſhop calls the *human Nature*, and *Cerinthus* calls the *Man Jeſus*: and this is *Socini-*

(*a*) Reflexions on the examination of his diſcourſe on the deſcent of the Man Jeſus.

aniſm

aniſm. And if it be ſaid, the Supreme God *did ſuffer*; this is the doctrine of the *Patripaſſians* and *Sabellians*, and contrary to the principle, that the *Supreme* God is *impaſſible:* and to ſolve this contradiction, is no ſuch eaſy matter.

If it be urged, as ſome have ſuppoſed; that not only the divine and human *Natures*, but the Two *Perſons* alſo, the Logos, and the human Soul, were *united in one Perſon:* Let us conſider, how *cloſe* this union was; and the conſequence of it.

It is remarkable, that the *Athanaſian* Creed ſays; "There is *one* Perſon [ὑπόϛασις] of the Fa-"ther, and *another* of the Son."—And the ſame Creed ſays; that "God and Man are One alto-"gether—by *unity* of Perſon," [ὑποϛάσεως] Here then we find; that, (if *Hypoſtaſis* means Perſon, as the Orthodox underſtand it, and the *Engliſh* tranſlate it;) God and Man are more ſtrictly united, than the Father and the Son: for the Father and Son are *different* Perſons; but God and Man are *united* in Perſon: i. e. they are One and the ſame Perſon: And if they continued perfectly united; ſo that God and Man were *One Perſon at* his Paſſion, as well as *before* it; then the conſequence muſt be; that, if *Man* ſuffered, *God* alſo ſuffered: for it will be a contradiction to ſay, that the *Human* Perſon, or Soul of Man ſuffered; and the *Divine* Perſon, or Logos, which was ſo united to it as to be the

ſame

ſame Perſon, did not ſuffer; or that one knew the end of the world, and the other did not: becauſe *Unity* of Perſon admits of no ſuch diſtinction, as the *one* and the *other*. And in this ſenſe, the Biſhop's aſſertion muſt amount to this manifeſt abſurdity; that the ſame *One Perſon* who ſuffered, did not ſuffer; and the ſame *One Perſon* who did know the end of the World, did not know it. And this his Lordſhip allows to be Fact; how unintelligible ſoever it may appear: For he ſuppoſes, that the name Chriſt ſignifies a paſſible and impaſſible Subſtance, in one Perſon; [ἀπαθοῦς καὶ παθητῆς οὐσίας ἐν μοναδικῷ προσώπῳ προσηγορίαν σημαντικὴν] a ſingle Perſon, in a double Nature; impaſſible as God, and paſſible as Man(*b*).—Now, if it be not a Contradiction to aſſert, that Paſſibility and Impaſſibility can exiſt in the *ſame* Perſon, at the *ſame* time; we may aſſert or deny what we pleaſe. In like manner, with regard to Chriſt's not knowing the Day of Judgement it is to no purpoſe to ſay, that Chriſt conſiſted of two Natures in one Perſon; according to *one* of which he knew it, and according to the *other* he did not: for, if he knew it in *either* nature; it cannot be ſaid of the Perſon of Chriſt, or the Son of Man, that He was *ignorant* of it. This will appear by a plane inſtance: A Man conſiſts of a Body, and a Spirit; and a Spirit has not

(*b*) Art. iii. p. 163, 164.

fleſh

fleſh and bones: Can it therefore be aſſerted, that the Compound *Man* has not fleſh and bones? By no means. It may be aſſerted, that Man *has* what *either* Nature has; but it cannot be denied, that he *has* what belongs to *either*. He may be ſaid to think, becauſe his Soul thinks; but it cannot be denied that he thinks, becauſe the Body does not. It cannot therefore be ſaid that *Chriſt* knew not; becauſe the *human Soul* knew not: If he was perſonally ignorant, he was totally ſo in *both* Natures; and conſequently could not, in either of his Natures, be the Supreme God.

But if the *literal* Unity of Perſon be not admitted; and we ſuppoſe, with the Biſhop, that God and Man were not ſo ſtrictly united, as to become *one ſingle identical* Perſon; but only *joined* together: Then, what muſt become of the Prophecies? For let the conjunction be ever ſo intimate; yet, if the Prophecies relating to *one* Perſon are not fulfilled in that *ſame* Perſon: but in *another*, that is joined to him; it will juſtly be argued, that they have never been fulfilled, in the ſenſe in which they were given; and, indeed, never properly fulfilled at all. If the Meſſiah be *one* Perſon, who was ſent down from Heaven to ſuffer, and never did ſuffer; and the Chriſt who ſuffered was *another* Perſon, who himſelf never exiſted till he was born of the Virgin

gin *Mary*; the Prophecy of *Iſaiah* has never been completed.

But there is no danger of this fatal conſequence: for, if we follow the Biſhop a little farther, we ſhall find; that there was no ſuch conjunction of Natures ever made. He argues, that there was no *Union* of *Natures*; becauſe there could be no converſion, or tranſubſtantiation, of one into the other; nor commixtion, or confuſion, of both into one: and that the two Natures kept their reſpective properties diſtinct(*c*). Now it follows, if the Subſtances were diſtinct; that is, if the Subſtance of the Soul, and the Divine Subſtance, were *unmixed*; and their Properties alſo were diſtinct; that the *Perſons* muſt alſo be *diſtinct*: for there can be no meaning to the word Perſon, that is not comprehended in the words *Subſtance* and *Properties*. And therefore *Novatian*, in order to be conſiſtent with himſelf, made no ſcruple to allow; that the Word and the Fleſh were *commixed*: affirming, that Chriſt was not only *Man*, but *God*, according to the Scriptures; *Divinitate Sermonis in ipſâ concretione permixtâ* (*d*): And *Origen* ſays, the Humanity of Chriſt was exalted to ſuch a degree of Divinity; not only by Communication of the Word, but alſo by its *Union*

(*c*) *Pearſon*, p. 161. 188. (*d*) *Novat.* de Trin. cap. ii. 19.

and *Commixtion*; by which it became a *God*(*e*). But his Lordſhip ſuppoſes a *Union* of Perſons, without any ſuch *Commixtion*; which is impoſſible. For if we mean *any thing* by this Union of Perſons or intelligent Beings, it cannot poſſibly be leſs than this; that they ſhall be ſuſceptible of, and obnoxious to, the ſame Senſations and Reflexions, the ſame Pleaſure or Pain, the ſame Knowledge or Ignorance. But the Biſhop tells us, No: "The two Natures kept their Properties diſtinct(*f*)." Now, if that were the caſe; ſo that the one ſhould ſuffer Pain, while the other did *not*; the one ſhould *know*, while the other was *ignorant*; 'tis plane, the Conjunction or Union of Perſons muſt be only *imaginary* or *nominal*: For, as neither the divine nor human *Nature* can either feel or know, but the divine and human *Perſons* only: to aſſert ſuch an Union, is to aſſert, that the ſame Perſon *did ſuffer*, and *did not ſuffer*; *did know*, and *did not know*; at the ſame time: which is as plane a conceſſion as can be made, that the Perſons were not one and the ſame; but *different* and *diſtinct*: for knowing, and not knowing; feeling, and not feeling; are the ſtrongeſt proofs of a *diſtinct Conſciouſneſs*, that can be given; and a diſtinct Conſciouſneſs is the ſtrongeſt proof of a *diſtinct Perſonality*; and, conſequently,

(*e*) Contra *Celſ.* Le *Plat.* Div. 31. (*f*) *Pearſon*, p. 163.

there

there could be no ſuch Union; as his Lordſhip contends for: Or, if it muſt be called a Conjunction and Union of Perſons, to ſerve an Hypotheſis; it is of ſuch a nature, as to leave no difference between a *Conjunction* and a *Separation*. But, how intimate ſoever the Conjunction is ſuppoſed to be; yet, as long as the Perſons can be ſo far diſtinguiſhed the one from the other, that one may ſuffer, and the other be incapable of ſuffering; (which is a ſufficient diſtinction to infer a Difference, and conſequently a *plurality* of Perſons;) the queſtion will be, *Which* of them ſuffered; and *which* did not? And if the divine Perſon did not ſuffer, becauſe he is the Supreme God, and incapable of ſuffering; then it could be only a mortal Man that ſuffered. So that, whether they be joined, or ſeparate, or the ſame; if the divine Nature, or the Godhead, that is, in plane Words, *God* himſelf, the infinite, ſelf-exiſtent, intelligent Subſtance, did *not ſuffer*; but merely the *human Nature*, or the Humanity, that is, *Man*; it was not the Blood of *God*, but the Blood of *Man*: And ſo the Biſhop's argument ends in the Doctrine of *Socinus*.

If it be ſaid, that Chriſt is both God and Man; "*God*, of the Subſtance of the *Father*; "*begotten, before all Worlds*; and *Man*, of the "Subſtance of his *Mother*; *born in the World* (*g*);"

(*g*) Athan. Creed.

the ſame queſtion will return: Was it *God*, begotten of the Subſtance of the *Father*, that ſuffered; or *Man*, born of the Subſtance of the *Mother*? To ſay it was *God* of the Subſtance of the *Father*, that ſuffered; is the Doctrine of *Sabellius* and the *Patripaſſians*: to ſay, it was only *Man*, of the Subſtance of the *Mother*; is the Hereſy of *Socinus*: and to ſay, that *Chriſt* did not continue conjoined to *Jeſus*, or the divine to the human Perſon, at his Paſſion; is the Hereſy of *Cerinthus*. And beſides, upon that Suppoſition, the Conjunction was diſſolved; and conſequently no Blood of *God* was ſpilled.

Laſtly, if the *divine* Subſtance of Chriſt be impaſſible; and it was *Man* alone, who ſuffered; how can our Sins be ſaid to be taken away by the Blood of *God* (*h*); who did not, and could not ſuffer? or by the Blood of *Chriſt* (*i*); if He be the Supreme God, as well as Man? It is manifeſt, the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians* cannot explane theſe Texts; which, upon the *Apollinarian* Scheme, are plane and eaſy. They are every way ſurrounded with Hereſies; and, by flying from any one of them, unavoidably fall into an oppoſite one.

If it be alledged, as the Biſhop ſpeaks; that by this intimate Conjunction or Union, whatever is true of the *Human* Nature, may be ſaid of the *Divine* Nature; and, *vice verſa*, whatever

(*h*) Acts, xx. 28. (*i*) Eph. i. 7.

is

is true of the *Divine* Nature, may be ſaid of the *Human* Nature; by a commutation of Properties(*k*): and ſo *God* may be ſaid to ſuffer; becauſe *Man*, which He calls the Human Nature, ſuffered(*l*). I anſwer; that, by the ſame argument, every propoſition in the New Teſtament, which relates to the Birth, Life, and Death of Chriſt, may be denied; and it may be proved, that Man did not ſuffer; becauſe the Divine Nature did not ſuffer: and the Impaſſibility of *God* may be aſſerted of *Man*. And an argument, which proves each Side of a Contradiction equally; and aſſerts that we may ſay, what we know to be falſe and impious; muſt be mere Sophiſtry.

It may be farther obſerved; though the Biſhop ſays, "By the intimate Conjunction of the Di-"vine and Human Nature, thoſe Attributes, "which *properly belong* to the one, *are given* to the "other—and therefore we may truly *ſay*, God "is Man; *&c.*—and what belongs to the Hu-"man Nature, *may be ſpoken of God*; and the "properties of the Human Nature, *may be attri-"buted to the Son of God*; &c." yet in the next paragraph, where he explanes himſelf farther, he allows; that the *eſſential* properties of one

(*k*) Gregory Nyſſen, in a Tract againſt Apollinaris, attempts to prove that the *Word* which appeared to the Patriarchs took fleſh, and was ſo intimately united to the human nature, that what belongs to *God* is attributed to *Man*, Dupin, tom. 3. p. 226. (*l*) Pearſon, 188.

Nature,

Nature, are not *really* communicated to the other Nature: *&c.*

And therefore, the moſt that can be made of this Commutation of Properties, as the Biſhop calls it, is not any thing *real*; but only *verbal:* It is not a *Commutation of Properties*; for they are not changed: but only a *Commutation of words*; or an allowed Impropriety of Speech. And the Blood of *Man* is *Called* the Blood of *God*, though it be not ſo in *reality*; by the ſame liberty of ſpeech, as when we ſay; that a *Man* is buried in the Grave: And the whole that the Biſhop has advanced upon this argument, amounts to no more than this; that the liberty of ſpeech allows us to ſay, that *God* ſuffered and died; becauſe a *Man* ſuffered and died, to whom God was *once* conjoined: but it will by no means prove; that his Sufferings were the Sufferings of *that God* who was ſo conjoined, and who is declared to be *incapable* of ſuffering; but merely the Sufferings of a *Man*, whom he calls by the name of *God*. And thus the argument, however ſpecious it may appear in *words*, is in *fact* a *Socinian* Doctrine; that nothing ſuffered, but a mere *Man*; whom, for certain reaſons, he calls by the name of *God*. Whereas the *Apollinarian* Doctrine, which is the Doctrine of the New Teſtament, declares the Suffering to have been undergone by the Divine Perſon *himſelf*; who

came

came down from Heaven to be born of the Virgin *Mary*.

To ſhew the Fallacy of his Lordſhip's argument in another Light, let us conſider a parallel Caſe; and examine the ſame way of reaſoning with regard to Man, conſiſting of Soul and Body. It muſt be allowed, that in common ſpeech we ſay; ſuch a *Man* is gone to Heaven; or ſuch a *Man* lies in the Grave. Here by the word *Man*, we ſometimes mean the *Body*, and ſometimes the *Soul*; and uſe the word *Man* indiſcriminately, for either or both(*m*). But does it follow; becauſe I am allowed to ſpeak in this improper and indeterminate manner, when I only mean to diſtinguiſh *one Man from another*; that I can uſe the ſame word indiſcriminately, when I want to aſcertain the *different Parts* of which the ſame Man conſiſted; or to inform another Perſon, perhaps an ignorant *Indian*, which it is that is gone to Heaven; the *Body*, or the *Soul*; and which it is that remains in the Grave? Can I then ſay, in the words of *Æneas*; *Animamque ſepulchro condimus*(*n*)? No: I muſt then anſwer, more preciſely and determinately; that the *Soul* is gone to *Heaven*, and the *Body* lies in the *Grave*; and not ſuppoſe a Commutation of Properties, and ſay; the *Body* is gone to *Heaven*, and the *Soul* lies in the *Grave*. And if I could ſay ſo, with-

(*m*) Note XXX. (*n*) Æn. iii. 67.

out

out an Impropriety; (that is, if ſuch a way of ſpeaking were allowable;) yet it would be no proof that the *Body* was actually gone to *Heaven*, and the *Soul* was in the *Grave*; but only an inſtance of the great liberty of ſpeech which was taken and allowed; of uſing the words *Soul* and *Body* ſo indiſcriminately and unphiloſophically.

But if a Man may aſſert, that the *Supreme God* ſuffered; when he declares him, at the ſame time, to be *incapable* of ſuffering; and this, only becauſe the *Man* who ſuffers may be called improperly by the name of *God*; and argue, that the merit of the Blood which this *Man* ſhed, conſiſted in its being the Blood of the *Supreme God*; this puts an end to all farther argument upon the Subject; ſince both ſides of a Contradiction are here planely aſſerted; *viz.* that the *Supreme God did ſuffer*; and at the ſame time *did not ſuffer*, but was incapable of ſuffering; and that the Blood of *Man* was the Blood of *God:* though it is allowed, at the ſame time, that it was not *really* the Blood of *God*, but only *called* ſo; being in *reality* the Blood of *Man*. And it appears to me impoſſible to get clear of this Contradiction, as long as Chriſt is believed to be the *Subſtance* of the Self-exiſtent God, which is *impaſſible*; and yet to have ſuffered on the Croſs. For the two Propoſitions are abſolutely inconſiſtent.

And

And it by no means ſolves or leſſens the Difficulty; to ſay, as the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians* do; that the *Divine Perſon* ſuffered in the *Human Nature* only: for the queſtion here is, not *in what Nature* he ſuffered; but, whether he ſuffered *at all.* A Being that is impaſſible can no more ſuffer in one Nature, than in another. The plain queſtion is this only, Whether the Supreme God felt pain? If he did not feel pain he did not ſuffer.

As the Biſhop's Opinion on this ſubject appears to me, for theſe reaſons, to deſtroy the fundamental Article of the *Chriſtian* Religion; i. e. the Death and Sufferings of the *identical Meſſiah* who came down from Heaven: So Dr. *Waterland*'s Opinion ſeems alſo to deſtroy the firſt and fundamental Article of *Natural* Religion; *viz.* the Belief of One ſelf-exiſtent and unoriginate Supreme God, the Governor of the Univerſe. He tells us; "He has nothing "to ſay, why the Son *might not* have been the "Father; but that *in fact* he is *not:* and that "there was no Impoſſibility, in the nature of "the thing, but that the Father himſelf might "have acted the *Miniſterial* Part(o)."

Now, as the Doctor ſees no Impoſſibility, but that the Son might be the Father; it is plain to me,

(o) *Philal. Cant.* 46. and 2d Pt. 12, 13. *Waterland*'s Second defence, 177.

that in *his* notion or idea of the Supreme God and Father of the Univerſe, he leaves-out the Attribute of *abſolutely neceſſary Self-exiſtence:* For if he did not do ſo, it muſt have appeared to him as clear as the light; that an originated Being, a Being who was *begotten*, could not poſſibly be *ſelf-exiſtent*, or *neceſſarily exiſtent*; in an abſolute Senſe: For to ſuppoſe, that neceſſary exiſtence is *poſſible to have been*, where in truth and nature it *is not*; is to ſuppoſe it not to be *neceſſary* exiſtence; but *precarious* exiſtence. If it had been poſſible for the Son to have been neceſſarily exiſtent, i. e. ſelf-exiſtent, he would have been ſo: and could not poſſibly have been otherwiſe: And if it had been *poſſible* for the Father *not* to have been *neceſſarily* exiſtent; he *could not poſſibly* have been *neceſſarily* exiſtent, or ſelf-exiſtent(*p*).

'Tis true, that Dr. *Waterland* ſays; "the "Father is *God*, in the ſtrict ſenſe of *neceſſary* "*exiſting*, *as oppoſed to precarious exiſtence*; and "the Son *God*, and the Holy Ghoſt *God*; in "the ſame ſenſe of the word *God*." But this is not ſufficient to prove them all Three to be the *Supreme* God; becauſe the Father is God, in a higher ſenſe of the word *God*, than is here uſed: For when Dr. *Waterland* ſpeaks of the neceſſary exiſtence of the Son and Holy Ghoſt, *as oppoſed*

(*p*) Phil. Cant. p. 13.

to

to precarious exiſtence; he does not mean, that they are *ſelf-exiſtent*, and *unoriginate*, as the Father is; but only that they are *neceſſarily* generated, or derived, or emanant, from the Father's Subſtance; and, in this ſenſe of *neceſſary exiſtence*, if there be one there may be one thouſand, or ten thouſand, neceſſarily exiſtent. Whereas, neceſſary exiſtence, conſidered in the *higheſt*, i. e. an *abſolute* ſenſe, as it belongs to God the Father; means *unoriginate*, *independent*, *underived*, *Self-exiſtence*: which is an Attribute of the Firſt Cauſe only; and is incapable of being communicated by Generation, Derivation, or any way whatever. And therefore, in the Senſe in which Dr. *Waterland* ſuppoſes the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, to be all *neceſſarily exiſtent*; in *the ſtrict ſenſe of neceſſary exiſtence, as oppoſed to precarious exiſtence*; and to be God, in the *ſame* ſenſe of the Word: he leaves-out the idea of abſolute, unoriginate Self-exiſtence; and therefore does not conſider the word *God* in the *higheſt* ſenſe of the Word, in which ſenſe it can be applied to no other Being but the *Supreme God*; i. e. the Father only: *viz.* that he is *un-originate*, and *ſelf-exiſtent*.

And this is the fundamental Error of Dr. *Waterland*; which runs through his whole Book. All his Miſtakes ariſe from ſetting-out wrong at firſt; for when once he had formed his idea of a *Supreme God*, without including *Self-exiſt-*

ence in it; he could eaſily ſuppoſe, that the Attributes of the *Supreme God* were communicable to the *Son*, and were actually communicated to him; and thereby the *Son* became equal in his Perfections to the *Father* himſelf, from whom he received them; and ſo the Perfections being the *ſame* in each, and the Subſtance alſo ſuppoſed the *ſame*; the *Father* might be the *Son*, and the *Son* the *Father*; for any thing this learned Chriſtian ſaw to the contrary: And he might, by the ſame way of reaſoning, as eaſily have ſuppoſed a thouſand Supreme Beings equal with the Father, as only one or two; for it is no Contradiction at all to imagine, that all communicable Attributes may be actually communicated by the Supreme God, to as many Perſons as he pleaſes. And this was the more eaſy for him to believe; becauſe he confined the meaning of the word *God* to the *Subſtance* of God only; and conſequently could believe every Being to be God, that partook of that *Subſtance*: and, as he knew nothing at all about the Subſtance of God, he might as eaſily believe a thouſand different Perſons to partake of it, and ſo become Gods; as one only. Nay, according to his notion, the number *muſt* be infinite: For, if the Son did receive from God the Father, *by a neceſſity of Nature*, equal Perfection and Plenitude in every reſpect; (which is Dr. *Waterland*'s opinion:) then the Second and Third Perſons,

Perſons, having the ſame Perfection and Plenitude of Nature, muſt unavoidably produce as many more; and ſo on, *ad infinitum*(q).

The Doctor therefore, who could ſee no difficulty at firſt, in ſuppoſing a Supreme God, without his eſſential and peculiar Attribute of *Self-exiſtence*; could eaſily ſuppoſe all that followed, as the natural conſequences of his firſt poſition. And the only difficulty he ſeemed ſenſible of, was this; how the *communicable* Attributes ſhould be actually *communicated* to two other Perſons, who had them not by Nature; and yet thoſe *other* Perſons, to whom they were communicated, ſhould be the *ſame God* that communicated them. If he communicated them to his *own* Perſon, this was no proper *Communication*; for he had them before: and if he communicated them to two *other* Perſons, then there muſt be *three* equally Supreme Perſons that govern the Univerſe; or three equally Supreme Gods: And how this could be conſiſtent with the Scripture Doctrine; which declares that *God* is *One*, *Jehovah* is *One*; was a great difficulty. But this is anſwered by him in as extraordinary a manner, as ſuch an unaccountable Syſtem muſt be ſuppoſed to require; *viz.* "That no certain principle of Individuation ever *has been*, or *can be* fixed." That is, when taken out of ſcholaſtic terms; that we never *did*, and never *can*

(q) Note XVI.

know,

know, what we mean by One; or how to diſtinguiſh One from more than One. This is juſt like the argument brought by *Cyril* and others, in defence of a Trinity of Three ſeparate Beings: in which they aſſert Three Men to be only One Man. But if we do not know the difference between One and Three, it is time to have done with all diſputes whatever; for we muſt be utterly incapable to judge of Truth and Falſhood. Thus the *Unity* of God is left to follow his *neceſſary exiſtence*; and theſe two principal fences being betrayed to the enemy; the Syſtem of Natural Religion is laid open to *Polytheiſm*, on the one ſide; and *Atheiſm*, on the other. For, if we have no principle of Individuation; *many* Gods may, for aught we know, be the *One* God we are commanded to worſhip; as Dr. *Cudworth* has obſerved: or, if there be only Three of theſe; and theſe are all ſuppoſed to to be *equal*; there can be no One of theſe above the other Two; and conſequently no *Supreme God* at all; but the τὸ πᾶν. Or thus: if no reaſon can be given, why an *unoriginate* Being might not be *originate*; there can be no proof of the exiſtence of any ſelf-exiſtent and unoriginate Being at all: For, if there be not ſome *ground* or *reaſon of exiſtence*, in the very Nature of the Firſt Cauſe; why he exiſts rather than not; which ground or reaſon of exiſtence is not in any other Being in the Univerſe: then he may, for any thing we

can

can prove to the contrary, ceaſe to exiſt; without any ground or reaſon for it: For if he could exiſt, without any ground or reaſon why he exiſted; he may, without any ground or reaſon, ceaſe to exiſt. Whereas all other Beings, whoſe exiſtence was effected by a *Cauſe* which produced the Effect; can only ceaſe to exiſt by a *Cauſe* which ſhall produce contrary Effect: and conſequently, they are leſs precarious in their Exiſtence than God himſelf; which is abſurd and blaſphemous.

Laſtly, to ſhew how far theſe principles will carry a Man contrary to all *Revelation*, as well as *Natural Religion*; it is from hence that Dr. *Waterland* concludes; that the firſt Generation of the Son (which he allows to be the moſt proper Filiation) is a mere *Co-exiſtence* with the Father; and not any *Derivation* from him: And Mr. *Cummins* argues to the ſame purpoſe: "For "having taken notice, that the Fathers not on-"ly uſe the terms, *Principle*, *Fountain*, *Root*; "but plainly aſſert, that the Father was the "original *Author* and *Cauſe*, of the Son; and "ſuperior to him, in reſpect of *Cauſality*; and "that by ſuch expreſſions they gave advantage "to the *Arians:* he declares his Opinion; that "ſuch Words ought to be exploded out of the "Chriſtian Theology: as having no foundation "either in Reaſon or Revelation. For (ſaith he) "if the Son of God be *God himſelf*, and of the

"*ſame*

" *ſame Eſſence* with the Father; to which Eſſence " it belongs to be *uncauſed*, or to exiſt *neceſſarily*; " He (the Son) can have *no Cauſe* or Author; " but is as much *without Original*, or beginning " of Being, as the Father himſelf. On the other " hand; whatever hath a *proper Cauſe* or Origi- " nal of Being, muſt have Limits of Being; and " that can never enter into our notion of " God(*r*)."

Thus, upon the principle that Chriſt is of the ſame Subſtance with the Father; which the Fathers, who firſt introduced it into the Chriſtian Theology, looked upon as a harmleſs and orthodox opinion; one Error has followed upon another, almoſt unavoidably; till the Sufferings of Chriſt, who came down from Heaven, have, for a long time, been denied: and the modern Metaphyſicians have at length completed the *Antichriſtian Syſtem*; by proving from it, that there neither was a Father, who begat; nor a Son, that was begotten by him: but the Son is as unoriginate as the Father himſelf.

The Opinions of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church being ſo various and unſatisfactory, I ſhall now lay before you the Reaſoning of thoſe; who have no dependence upon them, but take their Opinions directly from the Scripture.

(*r*) *Bennet's Iren.* 21. *Cummins*, 223.

Theſe

Theſe all agree; that Chriſt has ſaid to the *Jews*, in one place, *I and my Father are One:* and, in another place, *my Father is greater than I.* In ſome places, *He* is called *God*; and in other places, the *Father* is ſaid to be the *only true God*, and the *God of Chriſt*; and Chriſt himſelf calls the Father *his God.* And the queſtion is at preſent, as it always has been in former ages, how theſe Texts are to be reconciled?

Thoſe who ſuppoſe the Son to be equal to the Father, argue; that, when God and Chriſt are ſaid to be One, (ἓν, *unum*, One *Thing*;) the meaning muſt be, that they are One *God:* and therefore, when it is ſaid, the Father is greater than I; the Son muſt be conſidered as ſpeaking of himſelf, in the capacity of a mere *Man.* For if he were conſidered as *God*, he muſt be conſidered as the *Supreme God*; (becauſe there is but One *God:*) and there can be no greater than He. And ſince they are the *ſame God*, and yet cannot be the *ſame Perſon*; (for if they were, there would be but One *Perſon*; and conſequently neither Son nor Holy Ghoſt); their Unity muſt conſiſt in their being the *ſame Subſtance*(*s*): For it can conſiſt no where elſe; there being *no other* Unity, but that of Subſtance or Perſon. Whereas, if Chriſt be neither the *ſame* Subſtance, nor the *ſame* Perſon; he can be no God at all, but

(*s*) Note XXXI.

a *Creature:* and it is Idolatry to worſhip a Creature; and conſequently their Adverſaries are Idolaters.

Thoſe, on the contrary, who believe the Son to be *inferior* to the Father, as being *originate* and *begotten* of the Father; reply to this—firſt, that it is highly improbable, when Chriſt ſaid, *my Father is greater than I*; that he ſhould mean to inform his Diſciples, that the eternal *God*, Crëator of the whole World, was greater than a mortal *Man*, born of a Woman.

2. They affirm; that Chriſt is not ſpoken-of in Scripture, ſometimes as the Supreme God, and ſometimes as a mere Man; ſometimes as to his Divinity, and ſometimes as to his Humanity; but always in one and the ſame Character: i. e. as one and the ſame Perſon; who came down from Heaven and was incarnate.

3. That although Scripture declares the Father and Son to be ἓν, one *Thing*; yet it neither declares them to one *God*, nor one *Perſon*, nor one *Subſtance*; all theſe Interpretations being merely human: And therefore, they have the ſame right to aſſert, that it does not mean one *God*, or one *Subſtance*; as the Athanaſians have to aſſert, againſt the *Sabellians*, that it does not mean one *Perſon*.

4. That the ſame word ἓν, One, here uſed concerning God and Chriſt; is uſed in other Parts of Scripture, to ſignify the Unity between the

the Diſciples of Chriſt; that They may be ἓν, One *Thing*, even as the Father and Son are ἓν, One *Thing*. And in theſe places it is uſed in a third Senſe; which can neither mean Unity of Subſtance, nor of Perſon; And therefore it is a falſe Concluſion, that becauſe it *does not* mean Unity of *Perſon*; it *muſt* mean Unity of *Subſtance:* becauſe it *may* mean, as it does in ſeveral parts of Scripture, Unity of *Will*, *Deſign*, *Power*, &c. as it does here; where the Unity is ſaid to be [καθὼς,] of the ſame Nature, as between the Father and the Son; and ſo it is underſtood by *Calvin* and *Beza*.

5. They affirm, that it is raſh and impious to declare; that Chriſt cannot be *God*, except he be the *ſelf-exiſtent God*; becauſe the Scripture declares him to be *God*, and yet to be the *Son* of *God:* And conſequently, he is not the *ſelf-exiſtent God*; but the begotten *Son* of the *ſelf-exiſtent God:* otherwiſe, he muſt be his own Father; and his own Son.

Laſtly, they ſay; that, in whatever Senſe it is ſaid, that *God* and *Chriſt* are *One*, and that *Chriſt* is *God*; it will not make an Equality, or Unity, between the *Father* and the *Holy Ghoſt*; who is neither planely called *God*, nor ſaid to be *One* with the *Father*, any where in Scripture.

They conclude, therefore, for themſelves; that they are not Idolaters, becauſe they believe and worſhip but one *Supreme* God; ſuppoſing

the Son to be *God*, in ſuch an inferior ſenſe of the word, as is conſiſtent with the Scripture; which declares him to be *originate* and *begotten*; and conſidering the Government of the Univerſe as a Monarchy under one Perſon ſupreme over all. And againſt their Adverſaries they allege; that to ſuppoſe the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, to be each of them *God*, in the *higheſt* Senſe of the Word; is to ſuppoſe them all *unoriginate* and *ſelf-exiſtent*: and to worſhip each of them as *ſupreme God*, is Tritheiſm.

From what I have now ſaid, I mean to conclude, in the firſt place; that the Chriſtian Doctrine of the *Trinity*, which by falſe repreſentation hath been ſo long a ſtumbling-block to Jews, Mohammedans, and Deiſts, being looked upon as inconſiſtent and idolatrous; has nothing, in the *genuine* Scripture account of it, that is ſubject to any ſuch objection.

As to the Word itſelf, indeed; it is well known, that it is not uſed in the Scripture; and it muſt be owned, it was very much diſliked by ſome of the Reformers; who looked upon it as a relick of Popery. *Martin Luther* ſays; "The "word *Trinity* ſounds oddly, and is a human "invention; it were better to call Almighty "God, *God*, than *Trinity*." And *John Calvin* ſays, "I like not this Prayer, O holy, bleſſed, "and glorious *Trinity*; it ſavours of Barbarity— "The word *Trinity* is barbarous, inſipid, pro-

"fane;

"fane; a *human* invention, grounded on no "Teſtimony of God's Word; the Popiſh God, unknown to the Prophets and Apoſtles(*t*)."

But it may be anſwered to all this; that, ſo long as the Word is underſtood in a ſenſe agreable to the *Unity* of *Jehovah*, and the fundamental Principles of Chriſtianity; it can furniſh no argument againſt the truth of that religion.

In the next place I would have you obſerve; that the Doctrine which you accuſe the Chriſtians of holding, *viz.* that *Jeſus Chriſt* is the *ſupreme God*, is ſo far from being a doctrine of the new Teſtament; that it is abſolutely inconſiſtent with the whole Chriſtian ſyſtem: upon which account thoſe that hold it are obliged either to give up the fundamental principles of Chriſtianity, or to concele themſelves in myſtery and darkneſs. And Dr. *Whitby* tells us, "In "fine, this Doctrine that the Father, Son, and "Holy Ghoſt, are of one and the ſame indivi- "dual and numerical Eſſence, ſeems to bur- "leſque the Holy Scriptures, or give them an "uncouth and abſurd ſenſe; from the beginning "of the Goſpel to the end of the Epiſtle." And this he ſhews in ſeveral inſtances(*u*).

I have now pointed-out to you the moſt remarkable among the various and oppoſite opi-

(*t*) Unit. Tracts, vol. I. laſt Tr. p. 17. Luther's Poſtil. major Dominic. Calvin admon. I. ad Polonos.

(*u*) Whitby's laſt Thoughts, p. 51. &c.

nions

nions of the Chriſtians; from the beginning of their Diſputes upon the Trinity, and the uſe of that Word in the Chriſtian Church: in order to diſcover, whether there were not ſome one opinion among them conſiſtent with the Prophecies, that the Meſſiah, who came down from Heaven, ſhould ſuffer Pain and Death; and it appears, that ſuch a belief was once held by the firſt Fathers of the Church; before the riſe of the *Arian* Controverſy. But when the Chriſtian Church became corrupted by the *Platonic* Philoſophy; and the Corruptions which were then introduced were eſtabliſhed by human Authority, at the Council of *Nice*, under the *pretended* influence of the Holy Ghoſt; (when the Son of God was decree'd to be of the ſame generical Subſtance with the Father, and conſequently impaſſible:) this fundamental article was loſt by degrees, throughout all the Churches in *Chriſtendom*; the Chriſt that came down from Heaven, and was incarnate, and ought to have ſuffered according to the Prophets, was looked upon to be incapable of ſuffering; and the human nature only, that is, a mere *Man*, who did not come down from Heaven, is now generally ſuppoſed to be the Perſon who ſuffered; according to the Hereſies of *Cerinthus* and *Socinus*. And this Doctrine ſeems at preſent to prevail ſo far over the Truth, which is now looked-upon as Hereſy; that nothing but a direct appeal from human

Au-

Authority to the Scripture, can ever recover the long-loſt Truth; for the Scripture is the Rock, upon which Chriſtianity was firſt built; and the only Foundation, that is able to ſupport the Superſtructure; and of which a man may ſafely ſay, ὃς πᾶ ςῶ, καὶ τὴν γῆν κινήσω· and it is the everlaſting Goſpel, and not the decrees of *Nice*, or *Dort*, or *Trent*, or the Church of *England*; by the preaching of which the Kingdoms of the Earth ſhall become the Kingdom of God and his Chriſt(*x*).

It is the *genuine* Chriſtianity of the Scriptures, which I have embraced; and not the *artificial* divinity of the Scholes, or Councils, or particular Churches. What I find in the *New Teſtament*, that I believe; but what is not to be proved from thence, I look-upon as no Article of my Faith; and by this means clear my hands at once of all the Errors, which have been introduced into Chriſtianity at ſeveral times by authorities which are merely human; and preclude almoſt all the material objections, that have ever been brought againſt it; either by Deiſts, or others.

In the mean time, as *Our* Religion is not anſwerable for the Doctrine of the *Talmud*, and the Traditions of the Maſters; ſo neither do I look upon Chriſtianity to be anſwerable for the Doctrines of the *Fathers* and *Councils:* moſt of which have been eſtabliſhed by Vote, and Riot, and the Humour of the Times, and the Deference

(*x*) Rev. xiv. 6. Sir Iſ. Newton on the Proph. 250.

to

to Popes and Emperors, and the then reigning ſyſtems of Politics; rather than by the Authority of the Word of God(*y*). I confine myſelf therefore in this Apology merely to a defenſe of the Doctrines of the New Teſtament; and know no Authority, but that of *Chriſt and his Apoſtles*. And indeed I would not pay our own Rabbins ſo bad a compliment; as to ſubmit to any *other* human Authority, after having once rejected *Theirs*.

This was what the learned *Limborch* was obliged ſo often to repeat, in his *Amica Collatio cum erudito Judæo*; and what every man will find it neceſſary to obſerve, if he does not write for a Party; and determine to defend his principles at all events; *per fas atque nefas:* which has already done Chriſtianity ſuch an infinite prejudice.

In your anſwer therefore to theſe Papers, I muſt forewarn you, in the Words of Mr. *Limborch* to *Orobio*; what kind of arguments to uſe, and what to reject. *Omittamus particulares doctorum opiniones, voces ac loquendi phraſes in ſcriptura nunquam uſurpatas, quarum defenſionem in me non ſuſcipio*(*z*). Let us leave the particular opinions of the learned; words and phraſes, which are not uſed in Scripture; the defenſe of which I do not undertake: And again, *Nos hic autem ſolummodo inquirimus, quid D. Chriſtus ejuſque Apoſ-*

(*y*) See the VIIIth Letter. (*z*) Baſil Ed. p. 555.

toli

toli credi ab hominibus, ut ſalutem conſequantur, præceperint ;—non quid poſteriorum ſeculorum homines auctoritate humana definiverint; quorum decreta fidei Chriſtianæ regula non ſunt, ſed ſola verba Θεόπνευςα, *quæ in Apoſtolorum Scriptis reperiuntur*(*a*). We only inquire what our Lord Chriſt and his Apoſtles commanded to be believed as neceſſary to Salvation, not what men of later ages decree'd by human Authority: whoſe decrees are not the rule of Chriſtian Faith, but only the inſpired words which are found in the Writings of the Apoſtles.

" It is a moſt equitable rule," ſays Biſhop *Hoadly*, the great Patron of the civil and eccleſiaſtical Liberties of Mankind; " not to lay " upon the Religion of Chriſt *that which he* " *never himſelf put into it:* becauſe it was *He* " *himſelf*, that was to deliver it from the Fa- " ther ready framed; and becauſe he never gave " authority, even to the apoſtles themſelves, " to make any Addition to that Scheme of Doc- " trine and Salvation which He delivered to " Them.(*b*)" And Mr. *Chillingworth* ſays, to the ſame purpoſe; " The Bible alone is the Religion " of Proteſtants: and neither the Doctrine of " *Luther* or *Calvin*, or *Melancthon*, nor the Con- " feſſion of *Auguſta* or *Geneva*, nor the Catechiſm " of *Heidelberg*, nor the Articles of the Church

(*a*) Teſt. Scrip. c. viii. 599. (*b*) Hoadly's 16 Sermons, p. 179.

" of *England*, nor the Harmony of the Proteſtant " Confeſſion; but that wherein they all agree " with a greater Harmony, as a perfect Rule of " their Faith and Actions; and that is, the " BIBLE; the BIBLE is the only Religion of " Proteſtants(*c*)."

And Sir *Iſaac Newton* ſays; " The Authority " of Emperors, Kings, and Princes, is *Human*; " the Authority of Councils, Synods, Biſhops, " and Preſbyters, is *Human*; the Authority of " the Prophets is *Divine*, and comprehends the " Sum of Religion; and if an Angel from Hea- " ven preach any other Doctrine, let him be ac- " curſed(*d*)."

To this let me add the Confeſſion of Faith of the reformed Churches in *France*; which ſpecifies the Dangers, that Proteſtants are liable to, and ought particularly to guard againſt—It is not lawful for Men, nor yet for Angels themſelves, either to add to, or to diminiſh from, or to alter it; (*viz.* the Scripture;) neither may Antiquity, nor Cuſtoms, nor Multitude, nor Judgments, nor human Wiſdom, nor definitive Sentences, nor Edicts, nor Decrees, nor Councils, nor Viſions, nor Miracles, be brought in Oppoſition to it: but rather, on the contrary, all other Things ought to be examined, regulated, and reformed by it(*e*). And Mr. *Charles*

(*c*) Rel. of Prot. c. vi. § 56. (*d*) On the Proph. p. 14. (*e*) Daillé's Uſe of the Fathers, part 2, p. 129.

Dre-

Drelincourt quotes the ſame Words, which he ſays, "their Anceſtors preſented to their Kings "of glorious Memory;" and adds— "they who "are of another Faith, are not of our Religion;— "and—to oblige one's-ſelf to believe without "exception, whatever was believed in any age "whatever, after that of the Apoſtles, is to place "*Men* upon the Throne of *God*; and transfer to "the Creature the Honour and Glory which "belongs to the Creator."—"We have often," ſays he, "proteſted, and do again proteſt, in "the face of Heaven and Earth; that we believe "nothing at all neceſſary to the Salvation of our "Souls, which is not found *clearly* or *expreſsly* "in the Word of God contained in the Scrip- "tures; or is not taken from thence by *evident* "and *neceſſary* Conſequences(*f*)."

And the Church of *England* ſpeaks the ſame Language: telling us in the Twentieth Article, That the Church can ordain nothing, *contrary to* Scripture; nor enforce any thing *beſides* Scripture, for neceſſity of Salvation; and in the Twenty-firſt Article, That whatever is ordained even by a general Council, and not taken out of Scripture, hath no Strength or Authority; and conſequently, whenever the Church *miſtakes* the Senſe of Scripture, her *Authority* is *void*.

(*f*) Du Faux Viſage de l'Antiquité, p. 8, 7, 5.

I have now completed the whole of my Apology, as far as I deſigned to do in this Letter; in which I propoſed to clear myſelf from the Aſperſions, which have been caſt upon my Character; as if I had quitted my belief of the one God *Jehovah*, and joined myſelf to the Tritheiſts. Whereas it appears to me, and I think I have proved; that the Chriſtian Doctrine of the *Trinity*, as it is reveled in the New Teſtament, is conſiſtent with the Doctrine of the *Unity*, as reveled by *Moſes*; and I ſhall ſhew in my next Letters, that it is ſo explained by the moſt antient and moſt eminent among the Chriſtians themſelves. And as to the Idolatry of the Chriſtian Church, and all the Errors of the grand Apoſtaſy; which have laſted ſo many ages, and which I find my friends object to me; they are ſo far from forming any Argument againſt my embracing the Chriſtian Religion, that they appear to me a very ſtrong Confirmation of its Truth; by the Accompliſhment of thoſe Prophecies, which foretold that the Chriſtian Church ſhould be ſo polluted and defaced. And indeed, I look-upon Chriſtianity in ſo very different a light from that of a Religion oppoſite to our own; that I find it to be the Completion of ours in its moſt material Articles, to wit, the Return of the viſible *Jehovah*, or Angel of the Covenant, to dwell among us; and the Introduction of the New

Covenant

Covenant which he made with us, ſo plainly foretold in our own Scriptures(*g*). And upon this account I ſhall undertake to prove, in my Fourth Letter; that if *Chriſtianity* is not *true*, *our* Religion muſt be *falſe*.

To conclude: What the Scheme of Providence hath been from the beginning, and will continue to be to the end of Things, I confeſs it is my deſire to know; as far as God hath thought proper to revele it: and I look-upon it as my duty to ſtudy his Revelation, and follow it whitherſoever it leads me. And I am perſuaded, that no Man will ever comprehend it; who does not endeavour to *enlarge his Mind*, by the ſame Spirit of univerſal Benevolence and Love; by which the whole Scheme was at firſt planned, and has ever ſince been directed, by God the Father; and executed by his Son—to *throw-off* all regard to party and prejudice, and ſets of Texts appropriated to particular Notions—to *underſtand* all the Doctrines of it, whether they favour Chriſtians, Jews, or Heathens, (for the ſame *Jehovah* is God over all) in a manner conſiſtent with one another, and with the common ſenſe and reaſon of Mankind;—and *to ſee* how they all tend to the ſame great Event; when the Powers of Heaven ſhall be ſhaken, and the Kingdoms of the Earth ſhall

(*g*) Zech. ii. 10, 11, &c.

become

become the Kingdom of God and his Chriſt. For till he ſees things in this Order, Perfection, and Conſiſtency, he will have but a very imperfect Notion of the Chriſtian Religion.

The End of the First LETTER.

NOTES

AND

ILLUSTRATIONS.

I. p. 4. THE ſecond Article of *Sepher Ikkarim* is this: I believe with a perfect Faith, that the Creator (whoſe Name be Bleſſed) is *one*; and that *ſuch* an Unity, as is in Him, can be found in *none other*: and that he alone hath been our God, is, and ever ſhall be. See Dr. *Lancelot Addiſon*'s State of the *Jews*; p. 17. 18. 26. 27. 28.

II. p. 4. Here it may be obſerved; that, though the *Athanaſian* Creed tells us, *each perſon of the Trinity is both God and Lord, of himſelf*; yet the Chriſtians allow of no more Gods than one: uſing the word *God*, as it is uſed in the Holy Scriptures, in different ſenſes; ſometimes to ſignify *Jehovah*, and ſometimes *Elohim*, or *Adonai*, but *one* only to be *Jehovah*; i. e. the Father to be the only *God*, in the higheſt ſenſe of the word, as being unoriginate and ſelf-exiſtent; and the Son and Holy Ghoſt, in a lower ſenſe of the word, as being both originate. See Note XXIX.

III. p. 8. Thus Dr. *L. Addiſon* obſerves, in his account of the State of the *Jews*, p. 14: "The Bible, the rule of "all

" all Reformation, though it be not denied the people's " reading;" (among the *Jews* in *Africa*;) " yet the giv- " ing the ſenſe thereof belongs only to the Maſters; in " whoſe interpretation of the text, the vulgar, upon pain " of excommunication, are bound to acquieſce. This " was told me, as an *Arcanum Judaiſmi*, by *Aaron Ben* " *Netas*; a perſon not unlearned in their law." What the conſequence of this excommunication may be, even in a Chriſtian country; ſee under the article *Acoſta* [*Uriel*] in *Bayle*'s Dictionary. Nor are there any *Jews* (in *Africa*) to be met with; who adhere to the old Bible, without *Talmud* traditions. The *Talmud* is as much the Bible of the *Jews*; as the Council of *Trent* is the Bible of the Papiſts. The only people among the *Jews*, who do not thus preſumptuouſly impoſe the interpretations of Men as the word of God, are thoſe of the Synagogue of the *Samaritans* at *Sichem*; whom *Cunæus* (de Repub. Hebr. p. 353) ſpeaks of as follows: " *Eſt tamen eorum* (Judæorum) *factio quædam corda-* " *tior*; *ii ſunt* Karaïtæ, *qui, ſpretis hominum placitis, Tal-* " *mudica præcepta pro nugamentis habent*; *& nihil admittunt,* " *niſi ſacri codicis contentum. Sed id hominum genus cæteris* " *Judæis* inviſiſſimum *eſt. Itaque cum ſint oppido pauci, ſed* " *ad unum omnes ditiſſimi*; filias ſuas cum dote ſummâ vix " dare nuptum queant. *Hoc, quia ab aliis proditum eſt, non* " *referrem*; *niſi perſæpe moviſſet riſum.*"

There is a letter from theſe *Karaïtes* to *Joſeph Scaliger*, in a book entitled *Antiquitates Orientalis Eccleſiæ*, &c. p. 122; in which they accuſe the *Jews* of thus deſerting the word of God, and truſting in human traditions and interpretations. " *Nos credimus Domino* Moſi *& Monti* Gerizim, " *& in eo adoramus Dominum*; *verum* Judæi *aliis confidunt*: " *nos nequaquam facimus, niſi juxta mandata Domini in lege* " *ſancta per manum* Moſis; *ſuper quem Pax in æternum.* " Judæi *vero deſerunt quod dicit Dominus in lege, & faciunt* " *quemadmodum dicunt eis ſapientes & ſeniores eorum.*"

But ſo great is the inveteracy of the *Jews* to this Sect, and all others who refuſe obedience to the *Talmud* traditions;

tions; that they think nothing too bad for them: looking upon them as deniers of the Law, and only fit to be murdered. *Maimonides*, that learned Writer, reckons every one among the Impugners of the Law *(Legis abnegatores) qui negat expoſitionem*, (Legis ſcriptæ;) *ſeu legem ore traditam; atque ejus interpretes falſi arguit: uti* Zadoc & Baitos. *Teſchuva*, Cap. 3. The like is ſaid in *Maſſachet Avoda Zara*, Cap. 2, &c. *Hujuſmodi obſtinatum Traditionis oppugnatorem impune cujuſlibet manu trucidari poſſe aſſerit, in Tract* Mamrim *ſive de Rebellibus*; (Cap. 3.) *etiamſi nulli adfuerint Teſtes, nullum judicii vel indicii præceſſerit examen; hocque magni beneficii & meriti loco ducit.* Not. *Voſſii*, in *Maimon.* de Fund. Legis, p. 132. See *Prideaux*'s Conn. Vol. I. p. 322. and 415.

IV. p. 14, 75. *That the Chriſtians have never agree'd upon the ſenſe of the Propoſitions they diſputed about.*——*Cyril* and *Athanaſius* define a Perſon to be "*Eſſentia cum ſuis quibuſdam proprietatibus, ab iis quæ ſunt ejuſdem ſpeciei numero differens.*" Cudworth, 603.——Dr. *Waterland* allows Perſon and Intelligent Being to be the ſame, p. 350; Reply to Dr. Waterland's Defence, 352.——Mr. *Locke* defines Perſon, to be a thinking, intelligent Being; that has Reaſon and Reflection, and can conſider itſelf as itſelf. *Hum. Und.* B. 2, c. 27, 9.——Mr. *Bidle* ſays; By Perſon, I mean, as Philoſophers do, *Suppoſitum Intelligens.* Unitar. Tracts, Vol. I. p. 17.

The *Greeks* ſaid, there were three *Hypoſtaſes*; which the *Latins* rejected, as ſignifying three generical *Subſtances*; and accuſed the *Greeks* of *Arianiſm.* The *Latins* uſed the word *Perſon*; the *Greeks* rejected that; as ſignifying no *real*, but only a *modal* diſtinction: and accuſed the *Latins* of *Sabellianiſm.* *Athanaſius* ſummoned a Council upon it, to quiet the diviſion; and it was found that they were both of the ſame opinion; and only differed about words: upon which the Synod decreed, that thenceforth the *Greek Hypoſtaſis*, and the *Latin Perſona*, ſhould be taken in the

ſame ſenſe; to mean *particular Subſtance*. But the Scholemen have confounded the ſubject more than ever; by explaining *Hypoſtaſis* to ſignify a *Perſon diſtinguiſhed from the Subſtance*; in which ſenſe it is uſed by the *Romiſh* Church; was never uſed before; and is utterly unintelligible.

Mr. *B. Bennet*, in his *Irenicum*, p. 81. tells us; the *Auguſtan* Confeſſion uſes the word *Perſon*; not for a Part or Quality, but for that which properly ſubſiſts.

The *Wirtemburg* Confeſſion ſays, "*tres proprietates per ſe ſubſiſtentes*;" but whether the diſtinction of Perſons be *real* or *modal*, is a queſtion.

A learned Controvertiſt ſays; the diſtinction is ſomething leſs than *modal*, and greater than *real*.

Dr. *South* makes the Perſons to be *internal* Relations of the one Subſtance of the Deity to *itſelf*.

Dr. *Wallis* makes them *external* Relations of the one Subſtance of the Deity to *Mankind*.

Zanchy ſays; a *Perſon* is nothing, but the Divine Eſſence; diſtinguiſhed, and as it were individuated, by a certain perſonal property.

Junius thinks; the Perſons are diſtinguiſhed from the Eſſence, in notion only; *ratione tantum*; *ab invicem reali diſtinctione*: but really diſtinguiſhed.

Lud. Capellus ſays; *non re, ſed ratione*.

Mr. *Baxter* ſays; he is paſt doubt, there is in God a Trinity of eſſential, formal, inadequate Conceptions or Primalities; *viz.* vital, active Power, Intellect, and Will.

Others, to avoid the Inconvenience of defining, ſay in general, that there are three *Differences*; as Dr. *Tillotſon*:

Three *Diverſities*; as Biſhop *Burnet*:
Three *Somewhats*; as Dr. *Wallis*:
Three *Subſiſtences*; as Archbiſhop *Secker*.

Mr. *Fran. Cheynel*, in his Book of the Divine Triunity, ſays; "We may beſt reſemble all that difference, which "is between the Eſſence of God, and the Divine Subſiſ-

"tences;

" tences; by conſidering the tranſcendent affections of *Ens* " *ſimpliciter*, and the Attributes of God; who doth infi- " nitely tranſcend not only a prædicamental Subſtance, " but a metaphyſical Entity; as the moſt metaphyſical " men, who are ſound in the Faith, do honeſtly confeſs.

" Concerning the tranſcendental affections of *Ens*, " which are *unum verum bonum*, we ſay; theſe three Af- " fections, and *Ens in Latitudine*, do not make four things " really diſtinct; and yet we ſay, they are real and poſi- " tive Affections:" [and this is called *explaining*.] St. *Au'ſtin* being aſked what the three are, ſays; human learning is ſcanty, and affords not terms to expreſs it; 'tis therefore anſwered three Perſons, not as if that was to the purpoſe; but Somewhat muſt be ſaid, and we muſt not be ſilent. *De Trin.* L. v. c. 9.

The word *Homöouſios* or *Conſubſtantial*, was no more determinate than the word *Perſon*. It was rejected by the Eighty Fathers, who condemned P. Samoſatenus as *Sabellian*; and within fifty years was made the teſt of *Orthodoxy*. 1. It was underſtood by the *Athanaſians*, to ſignify the ſame kind of Subſtance, as the trunk and the branches and leaves of a Tree; or the Sun, its light, and derivative light; yet ſo exiſting, as that the ſecond and third ſhould depend on its original; as the light upon the ſun. 2. By *Gregory Nyſſen*, *Cyril*, &c. it was underſtood to mean the ſame kind of ſubſtance, exiſting independently; as three men. 3. By the *Montaniſts* it was underſtood that the Son and Spirit exiſted as parts of the divine Subſtance. 4. By the *Sabellians*, as one and the ſame identical whole Subſtance. 5. By *Euſebius*, merely that the Son was not of the Subſtance of the Creatures; dividing all Subſtance into *cröated* and *divine*. 6. By the *Lateran* Council, in a ſenſe, if intelligible, very little, if at all, different from the *Sabellians*, and the ancient opinion of *Samoſatenus*.

Nature is another technical term, much uſed in the diſpute between the *Eutychians* and *Neſtorians*; and the mean-

ing of it is as uncertain. *De Rodon*, a learned *Frenchman*, ſays; it is taken in *nine* ſenſes: and Mr. *R. Baxter* ſays, "the Senſe was not agree'd-on; before they diſputed the "matter." Ch. Hiſt. 98. "Though the *Neſtorians* ſtill "go for deſperate Heretics, I verily believe," ſays Mr. *Baxter*; "that all the quarrel was about ambiguous "words." And ſo Mr. *Sale* obſerves, in his preliminary diſcourſe to the *Koran*, p. 33. and quotes *Simon*'s *Hiſt Crit. de la Creance, & du Levant*, to the ſame purpoſe. See reply to Dr. Waterland's defence, p. 176, 374.

And it will appear ſtill plainer, how few men were capable of underſtanding theſe diſputes; if we conſider the Nicety of expreſſion, with which they were managed.

Neſtorius believed, the divine and human Natures of Chriſt were united; *non hypoſtaſi, ſed habitudine*. *Eutyches* was condemned for affirming, that Chriſt had but one Nature; after the two Natures were united. *Dioſcurus* ſaid, *Ex duabas (Naturis) ſuſcipio, duas non ſuſcipio*: That Chriſt is *of* two Natures; but not that he *is* or *has* two Natures. The *Eutychians* ſaid, he was *ex duabas Naturis*: others *in duabas Naturis*: And *Cyril* reproves *Neſtorius*; for aſſerting only an union *ſecundum perſonam*, and not *ſecundum naturam*: and one of *Quintianus*'s Anathemas was; If any ſay God Man, and not God and Man; let him be damned. *Baxter*, Ch. Hiſt. 120.

On this queſtion depended another; Whether the Virgin *Mary* was the Mother of *God*, as *Cyril* expreſſed it; or the Mother of *Chriſt who was God*; according to *Neſtorius*. This being a difficulty, Mr. *Baxter* thus explains it. He ſays *Cyril* ſpake *de concreto*; and *Neſtorius*, *de abſtracto*; one ſpake *materially*, the other *formally*. They both mean'd, that *Mary* was the mother of Chriſt, *who was God*; but not of the Chriſt *as* God; or of the *Deity*. One underſtood it of Chriſt *qui Deus*; and the other of Chriſt, *quâ Deus*. Baxter, p. 90, and 94.

This diſpute aroſe again in other ſhapes. In the days of *Hormiſda*, there was a queſtion; Whether it might be ſaid,

ſaid, that *one of the Trinity was crucified?* The *Neſtorians* laid hold of this, and ſaid; If we may not ſay this, then we may not ſay, that *Mary* was the Parent of one of the Trinity. *Juſtinian* ſent about this to *John*; and he held a Synod upon it; and it was agree'd; that they might ſay, contrary to *Hormiſda, that one of the Trinity was crucified.*

In the 5th general Council of *Conſtantinople*, *Theodoret*, was accuſed for ſaying, that *Mary* begat not God, in the Nature of God; but Man, as united to the Godhead. Baxter, 182.

Theſe diſputes begat another; Whether Chriſt, being God and Man, had one or two Operations, or Wills. The difficulty was; that one Operation, or Will, ſeemed to aſſert one Nature; which was condemned in *Eutyches*: and two Operations, or Wills, ſeemed to aſſert two Perſons; which was condemned in *Neſtorius*. And in this queſtion they were ſo confounded; that, at the ſixth general Council of *Conſtantinople*, *Macarius*, Patriarch of *Antioch*, profeſſed, that he would ſooner be caſt into the ſea; than aſſert, there were two Wills in Chriſt; thinking he held with *Cyril* and the firſt *Epheſian* Council. But this was not ſufficient: for though *Cyril* was called Orthodox, who was proved to aſſert *one Nature of God incarnate, after the Union*; yet "thoſe that ſaid as he, and "much leſs, were damned Hereticks:" and "thoſe that "allowed two Natures, and denied two Wills, after the "Reſurrection, were damned with the reſt." Baxter, 197.

And yet in another Council, where, *Binius* ſays, there were innumerable Biſhops; they all condemned the ſixth general Council, and their opinion of two Wills, and two Operations. Baxter, 202.

In ſhort, the Chriſtians had ſo confounded themſelves in theſe diſputes about Words, without defining the meaning of them; that, as Mr. *Baxter* ſays of the firſt Council of *Sirmium*, "they knew not who were, nor who

were

were not, Hereties: and the moſt violent Perſecutors, ſuch as *Cyril* and *Neſtorius*, *&c.* at length fell into the ſnare into which they had driven others; and it was almoſt impoſſible to avoid Condemnation, after being once ſingled out to be hunted down; a mere toſs of the die, who were orthodox, and who were not: Biſhops, and Popes, and Emperors, whether dead or alive, and even general Councils, ſhared the ſame fate. And theſe were the kind of Queſtions; upon which the Chriſtians thought they did God ſervice, by fining, impriſoning, and murdering one another. Baxter, 58.

V. p. 20. *Of the word* Creature.——Among the Heathen Philoſophers, the word *Creature* had two very different ſenſes. The firſt was large and indefinite: every Being was called a Creature, that was *not ſelf-exiſtent*, and *unoriginate*; whether produced *in* time, or *before* time; and whether ſuppoſed conſubſtantial with the ſupreme God, or not.

Plato ſuppoſed Matter and Spirit (ὕλη & ψυχὴ, the Subſtances of all things, whether material or immaterial) to be eternal; and ſo, it ſeems, did *Origen*; (ſee *Dupin*, p. 135;) and in this ſenſe, the inferior Gods, who were believed to be formed before all Time, out of ψυχὴ, the Soul of the World, are called by him ἀγένητοι, ἀθάνατοι, ἀΐδιοι; uncreated, immortal, and eternal: but yet, as they were originally *made into Gods*, they were conſidered as *Creatures*, or created Beings; notwithſtanding the divine Subſtance, out of which they were made, was ſuppoſed to be unoriginate, and eternal: to which purpoſe may be quoted that famous expreſſion of *Plato*, ſo much cited by the ancient Writers, Θεοὶ Θεῶν, ὧν ἐγὼ δημιουργός· Gods of Gods, whom I have created: ſo *Stobæus* ſays, "the Multitude of Gods is the work of the *Demiurgus*; made by him together with the world." *Cudworth*, 462. And yet theſe inferior Gods were ſuppoſed to be *conſubſtantial*

ſtantial with the *ſupreme* God: and, in like manner, many of the Fathers ſuppoſed, Angels, and the Souls of men, were generated from the divine Subſtance; but not therefore *uncreated* Beings. See Dr. *Cudworth*, p. 254.

In the ſecond ſenſe of the word *Creature*, which was lower, vulgar, and limited, the word Creature mean'd ſuch Beings only; as were made *in Time*, and were of a corrupt and periſhable nature. And in this ſenſe the *Orthodox* impute it to the *Arians*, that they believe the Son of God to be a Creature: but the *Arians* deny it; declaring him, as *Eunomius* ſays, to be γέννημα τῦ ἀγεννήτυ, ὐχ ὡς ἓν τῶν γενημάτων· κτίσμα τῦ ἀκτίστυ, ὐχ ὡς ἓν τῶν κτισμάτων· ποίημα τῦ ἀποίητυ, ὐχ ὡς ἓν τῶν ποιημάτων· καθὼς εἰρῆται ὑπὸ τῆς ἁγίας γραφῆς, Κύριος ἔκτισέ με. *Prov.* viii. 22. The *Arians* therefore did not believe Chriſt to be a Creature, in this low ſenſe of the word; but in the ſame ſenſe in which it was ſuppoſed to be uſed of him in the *Proverbs*, according to the LXX tranſlation.

Philo Judæus believed the *Word of God* to be neither uncreated and eternal, in the ſenſe in which the *ſupreme God* is ſo; i. e. unoriginately: nor yet a Creature, as other Creatures made in Time, and of a corruptible nature; but of a middle nature, between both: οὔτε ἀγένητος, ὡς Θεὸς, ὢν· οὔτε γένητος, ὡς ἡμεῖς· ἀλλὰ μέσος τῶν ἄκρων· being neither uncreated, as God is; nor created, as We are: but the middle of the two extremes, between the Maker and the thing made. See *Philalethes Cantab.* on Dr. *Waterland*'s ſecond Defence.

As the ancient Fathers underſtood the words, Θεὸς ἔκτισέ με, the Lord created me, *Prov.* viii. 22, to be mean'd of the Son of God; and *Col.* i. 15, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως· they did not ſcruple to ſay, that Chriſt was *created*. The *Apoſtolic Conſtitutions* ſtile him, *that Wiſdom which God created*; and *Melito*, Biſhop of *Sardis*, about the year 182, wrote a Book, περὶ κτίσεως Χριστῦ· of the Creation of Chriſt; *Reply to Waterland*, 326: and *Tertullian*, though he expreſsly

preſsly affirms the Son to be of the Father's Subſtance, yet calls him *factum & conditum:* and ſo *Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen,* and others; as the word was uſed by the *Platoniſts*; when they ſay of the firſt Cauſe, *de ſe mentem creâſſe*; believing, that *Mens* was not crëated from nothing; but was derived from the Firſt Cauſe. See *Cudworth*, 576. According to this Philoſophy, though the Son of God was believed to be *eternal*, and *conſubſtantial* with the Father; it was no proof that he was not a *Creature*; the word Crëation being uſed, as well to ſignify a Production from the divine Subſtance, as a Crëation from nothing.

VI. p. 21. *Of the Words* Eternal, *and* without a Beginning.——The *Orthodox*, as I have obſerved, had two ſenſes to this word; which they uſed, as beſt ſuited their convenience. Sometimes, in an abſolute ſenſe; as when they ſpake of the *eternal exiſtence* of the Son, as being the divine attribute of Wiſdom, exiſting in the Father by neceſſity of nature; and conſequently *unoriginate* and *unbegotten*. But they did not dare to uſe thoſe words; for fear of the conſequences: for, if he were unoriginate and unbegotten, he muſt either be the Father himſelf; which is *Sabellianiſm:* or, if different from the Father, then there muſt be *two unoriginate* Beings; *i. e.* two ſupreme Gods. And yet this is the ſenſe in which *Athanaſius* argues, when he ſays of the Son of God; εἰ ἀΐδιος ἐστιν υἱὸς, οὐκ ἦν κλισμα· εἰ δὲ κλισμα τυγχάνει, οὐκ ἦν ἀΐδιος: If the Son be eternal, he was not crëated; and if he was crëated, he was not eternal: For if ἀΐδιος does not mean an abſolute Eternity, but only an Exiſtence before all ages; as it was uſed by the Philoſophers; there is no abſurdity in ſuppoſing the Son to be both *eternal*, and *crëated*. The Ancients believed the World to be *eternal*, and alſo to be *made*; *Cudworth*, 254: and the *Platoniſts* believed the ſame of the inferior Gods; ſee Note V: and when the

Orthodox

Orthodox ſpake of the *eternal Generation* of the Son, they then uſed the word *Eternal* in a more lax ſenſe, to mean a generation *before all ages*; and not an *abſolute* Eternity. For both the *Athanaſians* and *Arians* believed; there was ſome *Time*, or rather ſome *Duration*, prior to *Time*, before his eternal Generation; otherwiſe *Athanaſius* could not ſpeak of him, as exiſting firſt, and afterwards begotten into a Son; ὅτι πρότερον, ὕστερον γεννηθέντα εἰς υἱόν· (*Athan.* de Syn. Arim. & Seleuc. & *Hil.* de Trin. lib. 4. Reply to *Waterland*'s Defence, 125) nor the Emperor *Conſtantine* ſay, that he was in the Father, πρὶν γεννηθῆναι, before he was begotten; nor *Arius*, ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν· and therefore, if the word is uſed in an abſolute ſenſe, *Athanaſius* is to be anſwered by the ſame argument as he uſes againſt the *Arians*; εἰ ἀΐδιος ἐστιν, οὐκ ἦν γεννητὸς· εἰ δὲ γεννητὸς τυγχάνει, οὐκ ἦν ἀΐδιος. If he is eternal, he is unbegotten; (for he exiſted before he was begotten; and conſequently, he was unbegotten:) and if begotten, then not eternal; (for there was duration, before he was begotten.) The argument is equally ſtrong againſt the *Athanaſians*, as the *Arians*. In ſhort, it is from the *abſolute* Eternity of God, that we prove him to be independent, and ſelf-exiſtent. But if a Being, who was begotten, and is dependent on another for his Exiſtence, can be *abſolutely* Eternal; no ſuch deduction can be made: nor can any *independent* Being be proved to exiſt.

On the other hand; when the *Athanaſians* endeavour to clear themſelves of this difficulty, by defining the words ἀΐδιον, and ἄναρχον; they clear the *Arians*, at the ſame time: as appears from what is ſaid by *Alexander* of *Alexandria*, and *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea*; who ſtile the Generation of the Son, ἀΐδιον, and ἄναρχον; Eternal, and Beginningleſs. *Alexander* ſays, μή τις τὸ ἀεὶ πρὸς ὑπόνοιαν ἀγεννήτου λαμβανέτω—οὔτε γὰρ τὸ ἦν, οὔτε τὸ ἀεὶ, οὔτε τὸ πρὸ αἰώνων ταυτόν ἐστιν τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ. Epiſt. apud *Theodoret. Philal. Cant.* p. 67. Let no one underſtand the expreſſion *exiſting always*, to ſignify

being unbegotten—for neither the word *was*, nor *always*, nor *before all ages*, is the ſame as Unbegotten.—And *Euſebius* ſays, as quoted by *Philal. Cant.* p. 67, υἱὸν γεννητὸν, ὐ χρόνοις μέν τισιν ὐκ ὄντα, ὕστερον δέ ποτε γεγονότα· ἀλλὰ πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων ὄντα καὶ προόντα, καὶ τῷ πατρὶ ὡς υἱὸν διαπαντὸς συνόντα καὶ ὐκ ἀγέννητον ὄντα, γεννώμενον δὲ (falſely printed, γενωμεν) ἐξ ἀγεννήτου πατρός—πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς ἀνεκφάστου καὶ ἀπερινοήτου βουλῆς τε καὶ δυνάμεως ὑσιούμενον. *Dem. Evang.* Lib. 4, c. 3. The Son was begotten; not as if he was at any time not exiſting, and *afterwards* begotten; but exiſting *before all ages*, and being pre-exiſtent, and exiſting always as a Son with the Father, [which *Athanaſius*, and many of the Orthodox, deny;] not being unbegotten, but begotten of the unbegotten Father; having his Subſiſtence by the ineffable and incomprehenſible will and power of the Father. And again, ὁ δὲ πατὴρ προϋπάρχει τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ προϋφέστηκεν, ᾗ μονος ἀγέννητος ἦν. καὶ ὁ μὲν καθ' ἑαυτὸν τέλειος, καὶ πρῶτος ὡς πατὴρ, καὶ τῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ συστάσεως αἴτιος—ὁ δὲ ὡς ἐξ αἰτίου γεγονὼς υἱὸς, δεύτερος ἔστιν υἱὸς καθέστηκεν. But the Father exiſts *before* the Son, and ſubſiſted *before* his Generation, as being *alone* unoriginated; and he is perfect (God) of *himſelf*; and *firſt*, as being *Father*, and *cauſe* of the Exiſtence of the Son—but the Son, as *being derived from a Cauſe*, is *Second* after him whoſe Son he is.

From all this it is plain, that the *Arians* allow the Eternity of the Son; in the ſame ſenſe of the word, as the *Orthodox* allow his eternal Generation; *i. e.* they allow it in the higheſt ſenſe of the word, that comes ſhort of unoriginate, and ſelf-exiſtent: and the *Athanaſians* do not believe the Son to be unoriginate, or ſelf-exiſtent; any more than the *Arians*.

It is ſaid; that God, from all Eternity, could act; and therefore, the Effect of that act would be eternal. But this is not true; in the ſtrict philoſophic ſenſe: becauſe the very act would be a date, or given moment, from which to reckon down even to the preſent year.

The

The caſe is the ſame; in regard to Extenſion. Though a line be infinitely extended; yet no point can be given in it, which ſhall be at an infinite diſtance from another given point in the ſame line. Fix the point, where you will; there will be a line before it. And the performance of an Act is the ſame thing, with regard to Eternity; as the fixing of a Point is, to infinite Extenſion: it makes the duration definite, as fixing the Point in a line does the Longitude; you may meaſure back to that point: and, if it were not ſo, a part would be equal to the whole; and a finite to an infinite: which is abſurd. There is a great difference, between having from eternity a power of acting; and having a power of producing an effect, which effect ſhall be eternal.

But ſuppoſing that ſuch an effect could properly be called eternal; yet it could not be called ἄναρχον, in the ſtrict philoſophic ſenſe; *i. e.* without beginning: for that word does moſt certainly, in the ſtrict ſenſe, include the idea of unoriginate and ſelf-exiſtent; and conſequently, ſuch an aſſertion muſt allow of two Gods. But if we leave Philoſophy, and conſider the words in the Scripture ſenſe of them; the Beginning will ſignify, the Crëation of all things by Jeſus Chriſt: and the words αἰῶνον, and ἄναρχον, will relate to the Duration *before that Crëation*; or before all ages; and Chriſt, who exiſted before that Crëation, will be αἰώνιος and ἄναρχος.

Plato ſays; When God made and contemplated the Univerſe, he rejoyced over it; and then he made Time, *&c. Eſſay on Spirit*, 128: and 'tis probable; the *Beginning*, mentioned by *Moſes*, is only conſidered by him, as relating to the Crëation of *this* World; in which there is no mention of the crëating Angels, or any other Beings. And St. *John*, it is probable, goes no higher; *John* i. 1. So that when the Scripture ſpeaks of other Beings, which exiſted *before the World*; having no meaſures of *Time*, whereby to denote the different durations of their exiſtence, (*Gen.* i. 14) they ſay of them all, that they exiſted in [or

before] the *Beginning*; or before the *World* was; or of *Old*; or from *Everlaſting*. *Gen.* i. 1; *John* i. 1; xvii. 5; *Prov.* viii. 22, 23; *Pſalm* xciii. 2, in *Ainſworth*; *Iſaiah* xliv. 8; *&c.* And in this ſenſe, the Goſpel is called everlaſting; *Rev.* xvi. 6; αἰώνιον; becauſe it was promiſed πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, *Tit.* i. 2; *i. e.* before all time: in which ſenſe the word was underſtood by *Chryſoſtom*; who tells us, "St. *Paul* calls that, which exiſted before "all Ages, *eternal*;" for in another place he ſays; "He "that exiſted before all Ages. The Son therefore will be "found, in this ſenſe, to be *eternal*: and he [St. *Paul*] "ſaith of him, that by him he made the Ages. Now, "it is manifeſt, that the Maker exiſts before the things "made.——But what is mean'd by *the Age*, or Αιών? It "is Time, in days and hours." Τὸ δὲ πρὸ αἰώνων τὸ ἀΐδιον φησι· καὶ γὰρ ἀλλαχοῦ οὕτω φησιν, ὁ ὑπάρχων πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων· ἐνηθήσεσθαι τοίνυν καὶ ὁ υἱὸς οὕτως ἀϊδίως ὤν. Καὶ γὰρ περὶ αὐτοῦ φησιν, ὃς δι' αὐτοῦ πεποίησε τοὺς αἰῶνας· ὅπερ ἐστὶ, πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων ὑπαρχειν. Ὁ γὰρ ποιητὴς πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων ἔυδηλον ὅτι. Tom. iii. Orat. 7, in 1 *Cor.* ii. 6. Τί πρὸς ἐστιν αἰών, εἰπέ μοι; χρόνος ἐν ἡμέραις καὶ ὥραις. Tom. iii. in *Gal.* i. 4. So Biſhop *Burnet* makes Duration before all Time to be *eternal*;—on *Art.* 11. and *Le Clerc* ſays, it was ſo underſtood; in the days of *Conſtantine*. Bib. Univ. x. 445. "When the Fathers call the Son *eternal*; which, I think, is not above once or twice in all their writings; they mean, that he was made by the Father; in that Duration, which Philoſophy calls Eternity; ſome ſpace before the World was made." *Second Collection of Unitarian Tracts*, p. 88. Archbiſhop *Tillotſon* ſays; He did exiſt, before any thing was made; and conſequently, is without Beginning; or Eternal. *Of the Divine Incarnation*, p. 119; Bp. Williams's *Vindication of Archbiſhop* Tillotſon's *Sermons*, p. 22.

The third *Sirmian* Creed ſeems to expreſs this the moſt intelligibly of any thing I have met-with on the ſubject; *viz.* that the Son was, *ante omnia ſecula & initia*; *ante omne tempus quod in intellectum cadere poteſt*; *& ante omnem com-*

comprehenſibilem ſubſtantiam: Before all Ages and Beginning, and all time that we can conceive, and all Subſtance that we can comprehend. And this is as high a ſenſe, as the words are capable of; without ſuppoſing them to mean, that Chriſt is unoriginate and ſelf-exiſtent; which is denied by the *Athanaſians*, as well as the *Arians*.

VII. p. 21. *Of the* Generation *of the Son of God.*—— In regard to this, Biſhop *Pearſon* ſays; the Communication of the divine Eſſence by the Father was the true and proper *Generation*, by which he hath begotten a Son.—A *Son* is nothing but another produced by his *Father*, of the ſame nature with him.—But God the *Father* hath communicated to the *Word* the ſame divine Eſſence, by which he is *God*; p. 137: and p. 34 he ſays; the *Father* hath the Eſſence or Attributes, of himſelf; and the *Son*, by a communication from the Father.—But Dr. *Waterland*, though he ſpeaks of a threefold *Generation* of the Son; two antemundane, and one in the fleſh; yet, when he comes to explain himſelf, denies any literal *Generation* of the Son at all: for he ſuppoſes his being in the Father, before he was generated, to be the firſt and moſt proper Filiation or Generation; which he allows to be a mere Co-exiſtence with the Father, and not any Derivation from him.—His ſecond Generation he ſuppoſes to be, his Manifeſtation to create; which is no Generation. And, thirdly, his Manifeſtation in the fleſh, to govern his creatures; which he explains to be nothing but a Miſſion, Manifeſtation, or Exertion, or taking a new office: and ſays; there is no change at all in it, no not ſo much as in any mode of exiſtence; but he was as much and truly generated before as after it. (See *Obſervations on Dr.* Waterland's *Second Defence*, p. 58, 59, 69, 72.) Thus in fact, he allows of a *figurative*, but of no *literal* Generation of the Son; either temporal or eternal. See *Phila. Cant. Farther Remarks*, p. 40, and *Firſt Part*, p. 41.

VIII.

VIII. p. 28, 79. *Of the Trinity of one ſingular Eſſence.*—The word Ὁμοούσιος, or *Conſubſtantial*; which was oppoſed by the *Nicene* Fathers, on one ſide, to the words ἑτεροούσιος, and ἀλλοιούσιος, of a *different* Subſtance; which contained the opinion of *Arius:* and, on the other ſide, to ταυτοούσιος, and μοιοούσιος, of one and the *ſame* Subſtance; which contained the opinion of *Sabellius:* could not poſſibly mean a *ſingular* exiſtent or individual Eſſence, or any thing elſe but the ſame *generical* Eſſence; which the *Platoniſts* expreſſed by γενότης, and the *Athanaſians* by ὁμοιότης, ὁμογενὴς, ὁμοφυὴς. And the words of the Council of *Chalcedon* are capable of no other meaning; ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιος ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα· conſubſtantial with the Father, as to his Godhead; and conſubſtantial with Us, as to his Manhood.

The words of *Athanaſius* are theſe; Οὐδὲ γὰρ υἱο-πατέρα φρονοῦμεν, ὡς οἱ Σαβέλλιοι, μονοούσιον καὶ ἓν ὁμοούσιον. *We do not think the Son to be really one and the ſame with the Father, as the* Sabellians *do; and to be Monöouſios, not Homöouſios, they thereby deſtroying the very Being of the Son.* Expoſ. Fidei, p. 241.—And *Epiphanius* makes the ſame remark: and ſays; Καὶ οὐ λέγομεν ταυτοούσιον, ἵνα μὴ ἡ λέξις παρά τισι λεγομένη Σαβελλίῳ ἀπεικασθῇ ταυτὸν δὲ λέγομεν τῇ θεότητι, καὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ, καὶ τῇ δυνάμει. *We affirm not the Son to be the ſame in* Subſtance *with the Father; leaſt this ſhould be taken in way of compliance with* Sabellius: *nevertheleſs we do aſſert him to be the ſame in Godhead, and in Eſſence, and in Power.* Cudw. 611. Accordingly, Dr. *Cudworth* draws this concluſion: It is plain; that the ancient orthodox Fathers aſſerted no ſuch thing, as one and the ſame *ſingular* or *numerical* Eſſence of the ſeveral Perſons of the Trinity: this, according to them, being not a *real* Trinity; but a Trinity of mere names, notions, and inadequate conceptions only. And p. 598, he ſays; To conſider the Trinity to be ſo undivided, as if *Three* were *not Three* in it; is to make the

myſtery

myſtery contemptible: [for then the Trinity would not be a Trinity;] and if the whole Trinity be *One*, as each ſingle Perſon therein is One in himſelf; then there muſt be a Trinity in *each Perſon*.——Theſe Fathers, it is plain, aſſerted a *ſpecific* Unity only; and not a *numerical* one: and nothing can be more contrary to this, than the doctrine of the *Lateran* Council; which is generally looked upon as orthodox, and particularly is eſpouſed by Dr. *Waterland*; that the Father and Son are *una ſumma res:* [Defence of his Quer.] and that the Son may be juſtly called the Father's Subſtance; p. 379, 380, 391.

We are told by the great *Baſil*, Epiſt. ccc; that the word Ὁμοούσιος corrects the impiety of *Sabellius*; for it takes away the Identity of Subſtance, and introduces a perfect notion of the Perſons. For the ſame thing is not [indeed, cannot be] conſubſtantial *to itſelf*; but *one* thing to *another*. Αὐλὴ δέ ἡ φωνὴ, καὶ τὸ τῦ Σαβελλίυ κακὸν ἐπανορθέλαι· ἀναιρεῖ γὰρ τὴν ταυλόιηλα τῆς ὑποςάσεως, καὶ εἰσάχει τελειαν τῶν προσώπων τὴν ἰνδιαν. Οὐ γὰρ ἀυλό τί ἐςιν ἑαυτῷ ὁμούσιον, αλλ' ἕτερον ἑτέρῳ. *Bulli* Op. 31.—Accordingly he ſays; God is not One in *Number*; but only in *Nature*. *Epiſt.* 141, *ad* Cæſar. and ſo ſays *Juſtin*; Ἑλεῖ τῦ Παλρὸς ἀριθμῳ, ἀ γνώμη.

All theſe writers therefore agree; to reject a *numerical* Unity of Subſtance, as the doctrine of *Sabellius*; and to admit only a *generical* or ſpecific Unity: and it was underſtood, in the Councils of *Nice* and *Chalcedon*, as in the words juſt quoted: and even Dr. *Waterland* ſays; the Subſtance of the *One* Perſon is not the Subſtance of *either* of the others; but *different*: however of the ſame kind, or united. *Philal. Cant.* p. 14. And Biſhop *Bull* ſuppoſes the ſame; and that they are joined together by a *Perichoréſis*. *Bulli* Op. 130, 285. But Dr. *Whitby* obſerves, very juſtly; that "Three Eſſences cannot be "One, and no more; by being *connexé & conjunctè:*" (*Laſt Thoughts*, p. 6) and, in his Preface to the ſame book, he ſays; "It is evident, from the words of *Athanaſius*

"*naſius*

" *naſius* and *Epiphanius*;" [which are quoted above] " that the doctrine of the *Sabellians* was exactly the ſame " with that of thoſe who ſtile themſelves the *Orthodox*; " aſſerting, that the Father and the Son are *numerically* " one and the ſame God: both of them teſtifying, that " to ſay the Father and the Son were μονοὐσιοι, or ταυτοὐσιοι, " of one and the ſame Subſtance," [which is the doctrine of the *Lateran* Council, and the *Romiſh* Church;] " was " *Sabellianiſm*. And to contend, that this is the doctrine " of the Church of *England*, is to diſhonour our Church; " and in effect to charge Her with that Hereſy: which " was exploded with ſcorn by the whole Church of " Chriſt; from the third to this preſent century."

IX. p. 41. *Of the* Arians.——As the *Arians* are accuſed by the *Orthodox*, of not giving a fair account of their Faith; let us ſee, Iſt. whether the *Orthodox* have done it more honeſtly and preciſely.——Biſhop *Pearſon* ſays; " the Hereſy of *Arius*, as it was condemned by the Council of *Nice*, is known to all;" p. 187: and again; " the Hereſy is ſo well known, that it needs no explication: and indeed, it cannot be better deſcribed; than in the Anathematiſm of the *Nicene* Council." That Decree is as follows. Τὲς δὲ λέγοντας, Ἦν ποτε ὅτε ὐκ ἦν· καὶ Πρὶν γεννηθῆναι ὐκ ἦν· καὶ Ὅτι ἐξ ὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως, ἢ ὐσίας, φάσκοντάς εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν, ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν, ἢ τρεπτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τὺ Θεὺ· τὲτες ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ Ἐκκλησία. p. 134. The Catholic Apoſtolic Church anathematiſes thoſe who ſay; there was [a time] when he [the Son of God] was not; and that he did not exiſt before he was begotten: or that ſay; he was of a different *Hypoſtaſis*, or *Ouſia*; or was created, or liable to change.——Whether this was charged upon *Arius*, as his opinion, by the *Nicenes*; or mean'd only to diſculpate themſelves; does not appear: but the Biſhop ought to have known; that the opinion of *Arius* was very different from what is there condemned:

viz. that God did *ante ſempiterna tempora unigenitum filium gignere*; *per quem & ſecula & reliqua omnia procreavit: viz. ſubſiſtentem illum ſuapte voluntate condidiſſe ejuſmodi ut neque* converti *neque* mutari *poſſit*. Epiſ. of Arius to B. Alexander. See Appendix to the VIIIth Letter. Now, if it was the opinion of *Arius*, that the Son was immutable; how could Biſhop *Pearſon* refer us to the Anathematiſm of the *Nicene* Council, for his opinion; as if it was there deſcribed.

It is obſervable; that *Hilary* has tranſlated the words, ἀλλοιωτὸν, ἢ τρεπτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τῦ Θεῦ, by *convertibilem & mutabilem Deum*; inſtead of *Dei filium*; and thereby deſcribed a Hereſy, that never exiſted. The Hereſy, condemned by the *Nicene* Council, did not concern any opinion about *God*; but his *Son:* for no-body ever held, that there was a time when *God* was not; or that *He* was not, before he was begotten. And if *Hilary* mean'd, by this omiſſion, to charge *Arius* with the notion, that God was himſelf *mutabilis & convertibilis*; it was a *coup de maitre:* for he muſt have known, that this was the very accuſation which *Arius* brought againſt the *Athanaſians*, as a conſequence of their opinion; and upon account of which he rejected it: as he himſelf declares, in his letter to Biſhop *Alexander*.

Dr. *Cave* has given us the Creed of *Eunomius*, as already quoted in p. 20. and yet, in ſight of the very words of it which confeſs Chriſt to be God, he ſays of him; *iſtud vero argumentum præ aliis jactitat, quod ex prima Idea Dei, Deum* ἀγέννητον *eſſe pateat: Chriſtus autem non eſt* ἀγέννητος· *ergo non Deus*. But *Eunomius* uſes no ſuch argument; and aſſerts the direct contrary.—The Doctor, to prove his aſſertion, quotes as follows; ἄντι γὰρ ἀγεννήτος, οὐκ υἱος· ἄντι υἱος, οὐκ ἀγέννητος. In which *Eunomius* argues very juſtly; "if unbegotten, then not a Son: and if a Son, then not "unbegotten:" inſtead of which, the Doctor has made him ſay, in flat contradiction to his own Creed; "If not "unbegotten then not God." Whereas *Eunomius* aſſerts the Son to be both God, and alſo begotten; through his

whole apology, as well as his *Fides Expoſita*. In one place he ſays, "from his being a Son and begotten, he is the "only begotten God;" and again, "he is the Lord and "King of Glory; as being the Son of God and God." *Fab. Bib. Græ.* vol. viii. p. 256. And in another place, he calls him true God: "and we believe alſo in the Son "*of God*, the only begotten God; the Firſt Born of the "whole Creation, Chriſt *true* God not unbegotten." *Ibid.* 255. To what purpoſe now is all this chicanery and miſrepreſentation; if all is mean'd to be fair and honeſt? But in truth, the orthodox writers are ſo jealous of the *Arians'* opinions; that they ſcarce ever repreſent them, as the *Arians* themſelves expreſs them.

II. I ſhall examine their real opinions; particularly what Dr. *Cave* gives us of them in the words of *Arius*: and ſhew, wherein they differ from what has been looked-upon to be orthodox.

Now 1ſt. as the *Arians* believed the divine Subſtance of the Father to be ἀγεννήτος, unbegotten, and ἄναρχος, without Beginning; they concluded, that it was *different* from the Subſtance of the Son; who was *begotten* and *had* a Beginning: and agreeably to this notion, they ſaid; Οὐδὲ γάρ ἐστιν ἴσος, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὁμοούσιος αὐτῷ—ὁ υἱὸς οὐκ ἐστιν ἴδιος τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας—ξένος τοῦ υἱοῦ κατ' οὐσίαν ὁ πατήρ. And he adds the reaſon; Ὅτι ἄναρχος ὑπάρχει. "He is not equal to the "Father, nor conſubſtantial with him—he is not of the "Father's Subſtance—the Father is different in Sub-"ſtance; becauſe he is without Beginning." But the *Athanaſians* believed the Father and Son to be of the ſame Subſtance; that is, of the ſame *generical* Subſtance; as two Men are of the ſame Subſtance; and the Sabellians believe them to be of the ſame identical *numerical* Subſtance.

2. As the *Arians* believed the divine Subſtance of the Father to be *indiviſible* and *uncompounded*; they could not believe the Son to be generated of or from it, in any *literal* ſenſe; either as being compounded with it, or divided

ded from it: and therefore they concluded, that the Generation of the Son was *figurative*; and was not a Participation of Subſtance, but a Crëation; as the word *Crëation* is frequently uſed in Scripture, with regard to Mankind. And they confirmed this from *Prov.* viii. 22. Θεὸς ἔκτισέ με, &c. And becauſe they believed it blaſphemous to ſay, that this Generation was out of the indiviſible Subſtance of the Father; and no other Subſtance then exiſted—they ſaid; Οὐκ ἐστιν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἀλλ' ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ὑπέστη· καὶ ἀνθ' ὅτου ἔκτισται τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσία· κτίσμα γάρ ἐστι καὶ ποίημα. "He ſubſiſts, "not of or from the Father; but from nothing: and he "is not of the Father's Subſtance; for he is created and "made." But the *Athanaſians* believed, the Son was *literally* generated from the Father's Subſtance.

3. As the *Arians* believe the Father and Son to be of a different Subſtance; they believed them alſo to be diſtinct Beings, ſeparately exiſting; δύο πράγματα· in which they agree'd with ſome of the Orthodox Fathers, as *Origen*, *Gregory Nyſſen*, *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, *Maximus* the Martyr, *Damaſcen*, *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, *Alexander* of *Alexandria*, &c. and differed from others, who believed him to be ἐκ πατρὸς, of or from the Father's Subſtance; as the Leaves are from the Tree; but not divided from it; as the *Athanaſians*.

4. They believed, that Chriſt was the only begotten Son of God; becauſe he only was crëated by the *immediate* act and power of God *himſelf*, ἀμεσοτάτως· and that all other Beings, the Holy Ghoſt not excepted, were crëated *by Chriſt*: in which they agree'd with *Origen* and *Euſebius*, men of as great character as any in the Chriſtian Church. And therefore they called him a Creature; but not like other Creatures.

5. They believed that the Son was generated or crëated before all Ages; and was a real Perſon, when ſpoken of, *Prov.* viii. 22. and that his Generation was over, as ſoon as he exiſted. Whereas ſome of the Orthodox believed him to be only an *Attribute*, when *there* ſpoken-of; and

that he was *afterwards* generated into *a Son:* and ſome of them believed him eternally generating, as Light from the Sun.

6. They believed the *divine* Being, who deſcended from Heaven and was born of the Virgin *Mary*, was the only intelligent Spirit that animated the *Body* of Chriſt; and that this *divine* Being ſuffered: but the Orthodox believed; that the *divine* Being, that deſcended from Heaven and animated the Body of Chriſt, was incapable of ſuffering: and that it was only the *human* Nature, or *Soul* of Chriſt, that ſuffered; *i. e.* a mere *Man*.

7. As the *Arians* believed Chriſt to be the Son of the only true God, and not the only true God and Father of that Son; it was very conſiſtent with their Belief to ſay, Οὐκ ἐστιν ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς ὁ Χριστός· "He is not the true God."— But if it be imagined; that by this expreſſion they mean'd to deny, that Chriſt was truely God the Son: the expreſs words of *Eunomius* prove the contrary; and *Arius* himſelf explains his meaning ſufficiently by what follows: Οὐκ ἐστιν ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀλλὰ μέτοχος καὶ αὐτὸς ἐθεοποιήθη· *i. e.* "He is not the true [ſelf-exiſtent and un-originate] God; "but receives his Divinity by Communication:" which was the opinion of *Origen*, *Euſebius*, and *Lactantius*.

As all theſe notions, moſt of them mentioned by Dr. *Cave*, follow directly from the firſt general principle and foundation, which *Eunomius* has ſo much laboured to eſtabliſh; it may eaſily be judged, whether either He or *Arius* have in any particular endeavoured to explain-away or ſoften their opinions; more than is conſiſtent with that fundamental principle. And this will be a proper Criterion to judge by, whether Biſhop *Bull* and Dr. *Cave* had any right to accuſe them upon that account. Biſhop *Bull* ſays; "If the *Arians* were aſked, whether the Son was "begotten of the Father himſelf; they allowed it: mean- "ing, the Son was ſo from God; as all Creatures are: "*i. e.* from him they had the Beginning of their Exiſtence. "—If it were aſked, whether the Son of God was *God*; they

"they confeſſed it: nay, more, that he was *true God*. "But, in what ſenſe? Why, becauſe he is *made* true "God. And when accuſed of calling the Son a Creature, "they denied it with diſdain; with this *reſerve*, that he "was not a Creature *like the other Creatures:* which were "creäted by the Word; and not immediately by God, "as the *Logos* was." *Bulli* Op. p. 34. Theſe anſwers are looked-upon by the Biſhop, as crafty and prevaricating; but in Truth they contain the real Opinions of the *Arians*, fairly and honeſtly given: though Biſhop *Bull* uſes ſuch ſevere language about it, calling it *in pervertendis ac detorquendis ſacrorum Oraculorum verbis, impia atque abominanda vafrities.* But ſtrength of argument does not lie in hard words: The Biſhop's adverſaries think, they ſee as much prevarication on the other ſide of the queſtion; *viz.* in defending the Immutability of a Being, who was *once* in the form of *God*, and *afterwards* in the form of a *Servant*; now in the higheſt *Glory*, and at another time ſuffering *Pain* and *Death:* or the *Impaſſibility* of a God, that *ſuffered* and *died*; or the *Infinity* of a God, *confined* in a human Body; *&c.*

Dr. *Cave* can ſay ſevere things in as big words, and with as little proof, as Biſhop *Bull*. He tells us; *Quanquam* tanta *verborum* monſtra *& propoſitionum* portenta, fucatis *&* ſpecioſis *explicationibus, homo* verſatilis *ingenii, pro re nata emollire ſeu potius tegere ſoleret; ſumma tamen errorum ſemper huc redüt: filium & tempore & natura & dignitate patre eſſe inferiorem, de non extantibus factum, & plane Creäturam; licet excellentiore creaturarum ordine collocatam. (Hiſt. Lit.)* He concludes, that he believed the Son to be inferior to the Father, in Time, Nature, and Dignity; made of a Subſtance not before exiſting, and plainly a *Creature*, though of a more excellent order than others.

But theſe notions were not the *Inventions* of *Arius*. They were held by men of the beſt characters, that lived before him: In ſhort, the moſt learned of the Ancients talked ſo much in the *Arian* ſtyle; that they are accuſed of

of *Arianiſm*. Reply to Dr. Waterland's defence, 331. And this the Adverſaries of the *Arians* confeſs; when they ſometimes accuſe *Origen*, ſometimes *Dionyſius Alex*: and even *Philo Judæus*, as being the fountain of *Arianiſm*. And this was the plea, that both *Arius* and *Eunomius* made in their Defence. "Theſe things, ſays *Eunomius*, we "think as we have learned them from holy Men; and ſo "thinking we believe: paſſing by nothing that we have "learned through ſhame, neither through audacity or "perverſeneſs adding-to or altering any thing. *Bib. Gr.* "Vol. viii. p. 261." And *Arius* begins his Epiſtle to Biſhop *Alexander* in this manner; *Fides illa, quam & a Majoribus accepimus & a Te didicimus, ejuſmodi eſt.* Wherein he gives an account of his Faith; and in which he has theſe remarkable words—*Quare etiam ante filium ſuum Chriſtum eſt* [*Deus*]; *ſicut a Te didicimus, cum id in media eccleſiâ prædicares.* Epiph. Hær. 69. § 7, 8. Accordingly, *Zonaras* ſays; (Tom. iii. Annal.) Arius *Dei Filium & Verbum* creaturam *dicere non dubitavit*; *& alterius eſſe Naturæ, nec Patria cœternum. Nec ipſe tamen auctor hujus ſectæ exſtitit*; *ſed* Origenes. (Sand. *Hiſt. Ecc.* 231.) And *Petavius* ſays; It was the great advantage of *Arius*, that many of the Fathers of the Church had ſpoken in ſuch kind of terms before him. p. 285. *ad Hær.* 69. *Origen* held, that the Son was created by the Father: and *Epiphanius* accuſes him of calling him γενητὸν Θεόν. (*Vales. apud Theod.* l. 2. c. 6. *Burnet*'s Animad. on Mr. *Hill*, p. 45. And, in his anſwer to *Celſus*, he ſays; we call the Son a ſecond God. l. 5. p. 258.) and adds; the firſt God or Father worketh not; no, nor properly ſpeaking, doth the Son or ſecond God. *ibid.* lib. 6. p. 318.—*Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* ſays of him, Ποίημα καὶ γενητὸν εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τε Θεοῦ· μηδὲ δὲ φύσει ἴδιον, ἀλλὰ ξένον καὶ ἰδίαν εἶναι τῆ παλρὸς· ὥσπερ ἐστιν ὁ γεωργὸς πρὸς τὴν ἀμπελον, καὶ ὡς ὁ ναυπηγὸς πρὸς τὸ σκαφος· καὶ γαρ ὡς ποίημα ὢν ἐκ μὴ ὄντων γενέσθαι. *Daillé*, p. 80. 83. *Dionyſ. Alex.* apud *Athan.* Ep. de fide *Dionyſ. Alex.* Vide & *Baſil.* Ep. 51. tom. 2. p. 898. *Facturam & factum eſſe filium Dei*; *nec natura proprium*,

prium, ſed hoſpitem vel peregrinum ſecundum ſubſtantiam eſſe Patris; ſicut agricola ad vineam, & navium fabricator ad ſcapham: etenim tanquam factum exiſtens non erat antequam fieret. (Sandii 194.) He alſo calls the Father and Son δύο πράγματα; as *Origen* had done: and maintained a difference between the Father and Son, not only of *Hypoſtaſis* but of οὐσία· or a difference καὶ οὐσίαν. See Reply to Dr. Waterland's defence, p. 450. *Juſtin Martyr* in like manner declares them to be two in *number*; and ſays, no man ever ſaw the Father; but only hear'd his Son and his Angel, who is alſo God by the will of the Father: and that the God, who appeared to the Patriarchs, was the Son, and not the Father; for as much as the Father is not capable of local motion, nor can properly be ſaid to aſcend or deſcend: which words, as Mr. *Daillé* obſerves, cannot be very well explained; without allowing a difference of *Nature* in the Father and Son: which were to eſtabliſh *Arianiſm.* (*Daillé*) p. 79. He alſo calls the Son Θεὸν ὑπηρέτην τῷ ποιητῇ τῶν ὅλων Θεῷ· the God who is Servant to the God of the Univerſe. Reply to Dr. Waterland's defence, 332. *Tertullian* ſays; there was a time, when the Son was not: and numbers of them agree'd in the notion, that the Son was begotten *in tempore*; a little before the beginning of the world: and conſequently, as Mr. *Jurieu* has obſerved; that the Trinity commenced but a little before the beginning of the World. See Note XIII.

All theſe were to the full as heretical as *Arius*; and yet they are ſpoken of with reſpect, and their Hereſies are overlook'd, or ſoften'd into Orthodoxy: (as the words of *Origen* are by *Dupin*, p. 25; and of *Dionyſius*, by *Athanaſius* and *Daillé*; 83.) while the ſame words of *Arius* are heighthen'd, with all the appearance of rage and malice, into Blaſphemy and Idolatry. "And if any one ſhall "wonder at this," ſays *Sandius*, "that the *Antenicene* Fa- "thers preached and publiſhed the ſame doctrine as *Arius*; "let his wonder ceaſe, when he obſerves; that thoſe doc- "trines were never declared to be heretical, nor condemn-

"ed

" ed in any Council before that of Nice; nay, that " there was no Heretic [he means, none that was looked " upon as a Heretic] before *Arius*, who held the ſame doc- " trines as he did. For the Anathema to theſe doctrines " was firſt of all denounced againſt *Arius* by the *Nicene* " Council; and afterwards againſt *Macedonius*, by that of " *Conſtantinople*: after which, it was no longer allowed to " preach or publiſh ſuch doctrines." *Sandii* Nuc. p. 230. and it was even a capital crime, to keep an *Arian* book.

Now when I conſider theſe things, I can hardly imagine it poſſible; that ſo much rancour and ill-will, both among the ancients and moderns, ſhould ariſe merely from a zele for Truth and the Honour of God: and not rather from ſome other principles which the *Arians* maintained, more directly oppoſed to the authority and power of the Eccleſiaſtics.

And the following obſervations will ſhew ſuch a ſuſpicion to be probable.—

1ſt. The *Arians* are accuſed by *Chryſoſtom*, of making the twelv'th Canon of the Council of *Antioch*; which orders, that a Biſhop who is depoſed ſhall appeal to a Synod; and not be reſtored, except by a greater number of Biſhops than had depoſed him. This Canon was directly againſt the reſtoration of *Chryſoſtom*; and ſo he palms it upon the *Arians*: and the *Romiſh* Church condemns it; becauſe it takes away the pretended apoſtolical cuſtom of appealing to *Rome*. See *Labb.* 595. *Bin.* p. 417. Col. 2. *Comber*, p. 105.

2. The *Arians* are likewiſe accuſed of the *Scripturarian* Hereſy; ot taking the holy Scripture for their only guide in Controverſy. " Theſe *Scripturarians*," ſays *Prateolus*, " *Satan* led away into error, as he did formerly the *Ari-* " *ans*; whilſt they admitted *only* the holy Scripture, re- " jecting the learned and holy Interpreters; againſt Whom " the Catholicks oppoſe Tradition." We ſee then, how the *Arians* came to be ſuch monſtres; in the eyes of the *Papiſts*:

Papiſts: and at the Reformation, theſe ſubjects were not fully conſidered.

3. Add to theſe notions, what we are told by *Epiphanius* and *Auſtine*; that *Arius* was enrolled in the number of Heretics, for denying the Lawfulneſs of Epiſcopacy. (*Nelſon*'s *Feaſts*, &c. p. 543; *Epiphan.* Hær. 75; *Auguſt.* de Hær. 53:) And we ſhall no longer wonder at his being looked upon by *Jerom* as an impudent devil; *Dæmonium meridianum*(*a*); (*Aug.* Apol. 2 con. *Ruffin. Daillé*, 80.) and treated by the Fathers and their Succeſſors with ſo much rage; and that the ſeverity of the Chriſtians againſt one another began with the baniſhment of Him and his followers.

It is a very common aſſertion, that *Arius* denied the *Eternity* and *Divinity* of the Son of God; but it never yet appeared to Me, upon good authority: for, he never denied the *Eternity* of the Son, in any other ſenſe; than that in which it is denied by the *Orthodox*, and ſignifies *unoriginate* and *unbegotten*; that is, *ſelf-exiſtent*. This accuſation is drawn, by way of inference, (in contradiction to the expreſs words of the *Arians* in their Creeds) from his aſſerting, with regard to the *Logos*, ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν. there was, when he was not: which is generally tranſlated, there was a *Time*, when he was not; but there is no ſuch word as *Time*, in the *Greek:* nor in *Hilary*'s tranſlation: and *Arius*

(*a*) 'Tis probable, when *Jerom* calls *Arius* an impudent Devil, *Dæmonium meridianum*, he refers to *Pſalm* xci. 6; where the words in the *Engliſh*, *Deſtruction waſteth at noonday*, are tranſlated in the LXX: απο δαιμονιου μεσημβρινου "the Dæmon at noon-day." The Peſtilence, that walketh in Darkneſs; is oppoſed to the Deſtruction or Dæmon, that deſtroyeth at Noon-day: And therefore does not ſignify *impudent Devil*; but refers to the deſtruction cauſed by Dæmons, through intenſe Heats, Plagues, &c. &c. See *Sykes*'s Farther Inquiry into the meaning of Dæmoniacs, p. 32.

believed, that the *Logos* existed "before all *Ages*;" (as Archbishop *Tenniſon* confeſſes(*b*);) and conſequently, before all *Time:* and *Arius* declares, in his Letter to Biſhop *Alexander*; (*Epiph.* Hær. 69, § 7, 8) *ante tempora & ante ſecula creatum:* and again, *ſine tempore & ante omnia genitus ſolus a ſolo Deo productus eſt.* And if ſo, *Arius* might believe him to be eternal, though creäted; according to the philoſophy of thoſe ages. And no doubt it was upon this account, that he deſignedly avoided to uſe the word *Time:* and made uſe of the Circumlocution, ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν. See Note VI. For it was the opinion of the *Platoniſts*; that the Generation of the *Word*, or Son of God, "was not "from any temporal beginning; there being yet no ſuch "thing as *Time:* nor, when *Time* was afterwards made, "did it any way affect him; for Mind [Νοῦς] is always "timeleſs, and alone eternal(*c*)." And accordingly, it appears by the Letters of *Euſebius*, written to Biſhop *Alexander:* that he (*Euſebius*) was perſuaded, that *Arius* and his Sect confeſſed the *Word* was Eternal: and he thought it a falſe imputation, that he taught the contrary(*d*).

Another peculiarity of *Arius*'s doctrine, from whence it was inferred, that he denied the Eternity of the Son was this; that he was not, before he was begotten into a Son; πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν. But then they believed him to be begotten from *Eternity*, and therefore to be *eternal*; according to the Philoſophy of the *Platoniſts*, which then prevailed, concerning their inferior Gods; that they were creäted, and yet were ἀιώνιοι, and ἀθάνατοι. For though the Pagan Theiſts ſay, "the word γενητὸν, ſtrictly and properly taken, "is τὸ ἐν μέρει χρόνου τὴν εἰς τὸ εἶναι πάροδον λάχον· (that which "in ſome portion of *Time* paſſed out of Non-exiſtence into

(*b*) *Tenniſon* on Idolatry. (*c*) *Porphyry* cited by *Cyril*, contr. *Jul.* lib. i. p. 32. *Cudworth*, 573. (*d*) *Dupin*, tom. ii. p. 2.

"Being);

" Being); yet in a larger ſenſe it may be taken alſo for " τὸ ὁπωσοῦν ἀπ' ἀιτίας ὑφισάμενον· that which is in whatever " way dependent on a Cauſe(*e*)." However; this opinion of the *Arians*, that Chriſt was not before he was begotten; πρὶν γεννηθῆναι ἐκ ἦν· was condemned by the *Athanaſians*: who aſſerted, that the ſecond *Hypoſtaſis* had an Exiſtence, before he was begotten into a Son; τὸν ὄντα πρότερον, ὕστερον γεννηθέντα εἰς υἱόν. And it is ſaid, that *Euſebius* was one that condemned this opinion of *Arius*; and gives us this reaſon for it; *becauſe all men believe, he* [*Chriſt*] *was the Son of God, before his Generation according to the Fleſh*(*f*). But there is reaſon to believe, that this was never ſaid by *Euſebius*; and is an interpolation, See *Bulli* Op. 226. If he did ſay it, it was a paltry Evaſion: for the *Arians* never denied his Exiſtence before his Generation according to the Fleſh; nor did *Euſebius* believe, they did ſo: but on the contrary they declared; that the *Word* exiſted before all ages: and that divine Generation before all ages was the beginning of his Exiſtence. And they founded their argument upon the ſame text, as the *Orthodox*; which *Eunomius* the *Arian* has twice quoted: *Prov.* viii. 22. which in the LXX runs thus; Κύριος ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ, πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσέ με, &c. Both parties believed the *Wiſdom* here ſpoken of to be the Son of God: in which, it is probable, they were both miſtaken; and the word ought to be explained in a figurative ſenſe, as it is by Biſhop *Patrick*.——However; upon this Text, which is called the *Achilles* of the *Arians*; the *Arians* argued, that the Son was *created* before all ages; *i. e.* from Eternity: and the *Orthodox* argued, on the other ſide; that he exiſted *in the Father* from Eternity, as the *Attribute of Wiſdom*;

(*e*) *Simplic.* in *Ariſtot.* Phyſ. fol. 265. *Cudworth*, 253, 254. (*f*) Reply to Dr. *Waterland*'s Defence, p. 124. *Athan.* de Syn. *Arim & Seleu.* & *Hilar.* de Trin.

according to the doctrine of the *Platoniſts*: and was afterwards begotten into a Son.

The *Arians* believed; that the *Word* of God never exiſted otherwiſe than as a *real Perſon*, or *conſcious Subſtance*; and that his Generation or Creation was the beginning of his Exiſtence; and that he exiſted before all worlds, and conſequently was *eternal*; in the ſame ſenſe in which the *Orthodox* believed the *Generation* of the Son to be *eternal*.

The Truth is, that the *Orthodox* had two ſenſes to the word *Eternal*; which they uſed, as beſt ſuited their convenience. Sometimes they uſed it in an abſolute ſenſe; as when they ſpeak of *eternal Exiſtence*, as an Attribute of God: and ſometimes in a more lax ſenſe; as when they ſpeak of the *eternal Generation* of the Son of God. But finding the advantage the *Arians* made of this laſt, "moſt "of thoſe who have diſputed with the *Arians*, after the "Council of *Nice*, have abandoned the ſyſtem of the An-"cients, concerning the two Productions; as *Alexander* "of *Alexandria* had abandoned it. This great man being, "it ſeems, more uſed to this controverſy, had found; "that this ſecond Production gave mighty advantages to "the *Arians*(*g*):" for if the Generation was eternal, and Chriſt exiſted before it; then a *created* Being might alſo be *eternal*. The Council of *Antioch* therefore, ſome years after that of *Nice*, anathematiſed all thoſe that aſſerted, "that there was an Age, or a Moment, before the Gene-"ration of the Word(*h*);" which is directly contrary to what I have juſt quoted, as the Tenet of the *Athanaſians*. So that thoſe Orthodox Chriſtians were under the ſame Anathema, with regard to the eternal *Generation* of the Son; which they had beſtowed upon the *Arians*, with regard to his eternal *Exiſtence*. For nothing could be done

---

(*g*) Bp. Burnet's Animadverſions on Mr. Hill, p. 44.
(*h*) *Dupin*, tom. ii. p. 322.

in

in thoſe days, without an Anathema: every Miſtake was magnified into a Hereſy; and every Hereſy was to be anathematiſed.

Secondly: As to the charge againſt *Arius*, that he did not believe the *Divinity* of Chriſt; it by no means appears to be true: for it was upon this very account; *viz.* becauſe he worſhipped the Son of God, ſuppoſing him at the ſame time to be a God crëated before all ages; that his adverſaries accuſed him of Idolatry. Now, if he was idolatrous in believing Chriſt to be a crëated God: it is impoſſible he ſhould at the ſame time be guilty of denying his Divinity.

Again, *Theodoret* tells us; it was the opinion of *Arius* and *Eunomius*, that Chriſt took a Body; but the Godhead or Divinity performed the Office of a Soul: Θεότητα δὲ ψυχῆς ἐνηξηκέναι τὴν χρείαν. *Athanaſius* ſays; *Arius* taught, that Chriſt had the Fleſh as a Covering to the Divinity or Godhead; Ἀρεῖος δὲ σάρκα μόνον πρὸς ἀποκρυφὴν τῆς Θεότητος ὁμολογεῖ· ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ ἔνωθεν ἐν ἡμῖν ἀνθρώπῳ, τοῦτ' ἐστι τῆς ψυχῆς, τὸν Λόγον ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ λέγει γίγονέναι (*k*). Now, if *Arius* believed the Divinity to be incarnate in Chriſt, and worſhipped Chriſt as being God; How can it be ſaid, that he denied his Divinity? The true reaſon, why the *Orthodox* accuſed the *Arians* of this, is; becauſe the *Arians* ſuppoſed the *Word* to be *crëated:* upon which the *Orthodox* argued; that, if the *Arians* believed him to be *crëated*, they did not believe him to be *God:* whereas the *Arians* believed him to be both. Moreover, the *Arians* denied the Word to be ὁμοούσιον, conſubſtantial with the Father; thinking it an abſurd and blaſphemous opinion: and this alſo the *Nicene* Fathers looked-upon to be a denial of his *Divinity*; for they argued, That whatever is conſubſtantial with the

(*k*) *Athan.* de *Ad. Chriſt.* cum Apol. l. ii. n. 3. p. 942; and Note XXVI,

Father,

Father, is *God*; and whatever is non-conſubſtantial with the Father, is not *God*(*l*).

But both theſe propoſitions are denied by ſeveral of the *Orthodox*; as well as the *Arians*. For, as to the firſt; *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Lactantius*, and other antient Chriſtian writers, thought even Angels, and the Souls of Men, to be conſubſtantial with, or generated from, the divine Subſtance; but they did not therefore believe them to be *God*. Reply to Waterland's defence, 285. Cudworth, 535. And the ſecond Propoſition, That whatever was not *conſubſtantial* with the Father was not *God*; muſt have been denied by all thoſe, that believed the Son could receive his Divinity by the *Communication* of it; as *Origen*, *Lactantius*, &c. And farther, if the word *Conſubſtantial* be underſtood to mean, of the ſame *numerical* Subſtance; according to the notion fixed at the Council of *Lateran*; then this Propoſition muſt alſo have been denied by *Greg. Nyſſen*, *Cyril*, and all the Orthodox; who believed the Trinity to be three Individuals ſeparately exiſting. Let any one read the ſecond Chapter of Euſebius, Eccleſ. Hiſt. together with its Title of the Pre-exiſtence and Divinity of Chriſt, and he will ſee that Euſebius had a very different meaning to the word Divinity than is generally affixed to it by the Moderns. See the End of the Poſtſcript to the third Chapter.

X. p. 43, 59. *Favourers of the* Arians.——Mr. *Richard Baxter* calls the Opinion of *Arius*, a *Miſtake*: and ſays; "the *Samoſatenians*, and *Photinians*, and our late *Socinians*, are far more perniciouſly heretical, than *Arius*." Church Hiſtory, 48.

The ever memorable *John Hales*, of Eton, conſiders it in the ſame light; not as a *Hereſy*, but a *Miſtake*. He

(*l*) Cudworth, 608 to 611.

allows

allows *Manichæiſm*, *Valentinianiſm*, *Marcioniſm*, and *Mohammediſm*, to be truly and properly *Hereſies*; for, ſays he, we know they *received* them *not*; but *minted* them themſelves: and ſo knew, that they taught a Lie. But can any man vouch, that *Arius*, and *Neſtorius*, and Others, who taught erroneouſly concerning the Trinity, or the Perſon of our Saviour, did maliciouſly invent what they taught; and did not rather fall into it by Error and Miſtake? Hale's Tracts, 181. See the Arian Creed as above, p. 37.

Eraſmus, the reſtorer of Learning, has given occaſion both to his Friends and Enemies to think him an *Arian*. He ſaith, *Phil.* ii. 6. was the principal Argument of the Fathers againſt the *Arians*; but that, to ſay truth, it proves nothing againſt them: he notes, on *Eph.* v. 5. that the word *God*, when uſed abſolutely, always ſignifies the Father: and he denies that the *Arians* were Heretics, in the *Scholia* to the third tome of St. *Jerom*'s Epiſtles; and, in an Epiſtle to *Bilibaldus Pirkheimerus*, ſays; I could be of the *Arian* Perſuaſion, if *the Church* approved of it. [And *Bellarmine* ſays of him; that he could not more openly eſpouſe the *Arian* Cauſe, than he has done in his Notes on the Fathers, and the principal Texts of Scripture. Pref. ad Lib. v. de *Chriſto*; Unit. Tracts, tom. v. p. 3. of the 5th Tract.

Epiſcopius ſays, that three equal *Perſons* in the Godhead make three *Gods*; and denies, that the Lord *Jeſus* is the Son of God by *ſubſtantial Generation*: *i. e.* by Generation from the Father's Subſtance or Eſſence.

Sandius undertakes to prove, in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; that all Antiquity was *Arian*; and *Petavius* ſhews the *Antenicene* Fathers to have been of that opinion: upon which *Sandius* concludes, that he was of the ſame opinion *himſelf*. *Bulli* Def. Fid. *Nic.* Procem. p. 4; *Petav.* de Trin. l. i. c. 5. § 7. & cap. 8. § 2; *Sandii* Eccleſ. Hiſt. l. i. 232. And *Dupin* declares; that he is not able to clear

clear the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions from *Arianiſm*, without doing them violence, p. 33. Note I.

Mr. *Chillingworth*, in anſwer to a Letter from a Friend; who deſired to know, what judgement might be made of *Arianiſm* from the ſenſe of Antiquity; writes as follows: "I was miſtaken; in directing you to *Euſebius*, for the "matter you wot of. You ſhall find it in a witneſs, "much farther from exception herein than *Euſebius*; "even *Athanaſius* himſelf, the greateſt Adverſary of that "Doctrine; and *Hilary*, who was his Second." See the firſt, in Ep. de Syn. *Arim.* & *Seleuc.* p. 917. D. tom. i. Edit. *Par.* 1627. See the ſecond, de Synod. fol. 97. "In the firſt you ſhall find; the Eighty Fathers, who "condemned *Samoſatenus*, affirmed expreſsly—that the "Son is not of the *ſame Eſſence* of the Father: which is "to contradict formally the Council of *Nice*; which "decree'd the Son *cöeſſential* to the Father. In the ſecond "you ſhall find theſe words, to the ſame purpoſe:—*Octoginta Epiſcopi olim reſpuerunt τὸ* Homöouſion. See alſo, "if you pleaſe, *Juſt. con. Tryph.* p. 283, 356, 357; "*Tertull.* againſt *Prax.* cap. ix; *Novat. de Trin. in fine*, "who is joined with *Tertull. Athanaſ. Ep. de fide div. Alex.* tom. i. p. 551; *Baſil.* tom. ii. p. 802, 803, Ed. "*Par.* 1618. See St. *Hierome Apol.* 2, *contr. Ruff.* tom. "ii, p. 529. *Par.* 1579. See *Petav.* upon *Epiph.* his "*Panar. ad Hæreſ.* 69, *quæ eſt* Arii, 385. And conſider "well how he clears *Lucian* the Martyr from *Arianiſm*; "and what he there confeſſes of all the ancient Fathers.

"If you could underſtand *French*, I would refer you to "*Perron*, p. 633, of his Reply to King *James*; where "you ſhall find theſe words:——If a man ſhould demand "of an *Arian*, if he would ſubmit to the judgment of "the Church of the ages precedent to that of *Conſtantine*; "he would make no difficulty of it: but would himſelf "preſs, that the controverſy might be decided by that "little which remains to us of the Authors of that time.

For

" For an *Arian* would find in *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and " others which remain of thoſe ages, that the Son is the " *Inſtrument* of the Father; that the Father *commanded* the " Son, in the works of Crëation; that the Father and " the Son are *aliud* et *aliud*: which things he that ſhould " now hold, now when the language of the Church is " more examined, would be eſteemed a very *Arian*.

" If you read *Bellarmine* touching this matter; you " ſhall find, that he is troubled excedingly to find any " tolerable gloſſes for the ſpeeches of the Fathers before " the Council of *Nice*, which are againſt him: and yet " he conceles the ſtrongeſt of them; and to counterpoiſe " them, cites Authors that have indeed ancient *Names*; " but ſuch as he himſelf has ſtigmatiſed for ſpurious or " doubtful, in his book *de Scrip. Eccleſ.*

" Were I at leiſure, and had a little longer time; I " could refer you to ſome, that acknowledge *Origen*'s " judgement to be alſo againſt them in this matter. " And *Fiſher*, in his Anſwer to Dr. *White*'s Nine Queſ- " tions, has a place almoſt parallel to the above-cited " out of *Perron*.

" In a word, whoſoever ſhall freely and impartially " conſider of this thing; and how, on the other ſide, " the ancient Fathers' weapons againſt the *Arians* are in " a manner only places of Scripture; (and thoſe now for " the moſt part diſcarded, as impertinent and uncon- " cluding;) and how in the Argument drawn from the " authority of the ahcient Fathers, they are almoſt always " Defendents, and ſcarce ever Opponents; he ſhall not " chooſe but confeſs, or at leaſt be very inclinable to be- " lieve; that the Doctrine of *Arius* is either a *Truth*, or " at leaſt *no damnable Hereſy*." See the Life of Mr. *Chil-lingworth*, by *Des Maizeaux*, p. 51; Eſſay on Spirit, p. 116. See *Cudworth*, Int. Syſ. l. i. c. iv. p. 595.

Biſhop *Bull*, ſpeaking of the ſentiments of *Origen* upon the Trinity, ſays; " I conclude thus with myſelf, that

" *Origen*, who hath been ſo ſeverely cenſured by Divines " both antient and modern, was really Catholic in the " article of the ſacred Trinity: although in the manner " of explaining that Article, he ſometimes ſpeaks other- " wiſe than the Catholics do; which is no more than " almoſt all the Fathers did, who lived before the Coun- " cil of *Nice*." *Bulli* Def. Fid. *Nic.* Sect. ii, c. 9. § 22. Eſſay on Spirit, p. 120.

XI. p. 45. Mr. *Daillé*, towards the end of the third Chapter of his treatiſe of the right uſe of the Fathers, ſays of them; " Let the reader now judge, whether or no " theſe writings having come down through ſo many " ages, and paſſed through ſo many hands, which are " either known to have been notoriouſly guilty of for- " gery, or at leaſt ſtrongly ſuſpected of it; the Truth in " the mean time having made on its part very weak re- " ſiſtence againſt theſe impoſtures; it be not a very hard " matter to diſcover, among the infinite number of books " that are now extant, and go under the names of the " Fathers: which are thoſe that *truly* belong to them, " and which again are thoſe that are *falſely* impoſed upon " them."

And in another place, he ſays; " What makes the " difficulty to find the Truth ſtill greater; thoſe writings " of the Fathers, which are legitimate, have been in " many places corrupted; by Time, Ignorance, Fraud, " both pious and malicious; both in former and later " ages:" which he ſhews to have been done both by the " Orthodox and Heretics. " They have made no " ſcruple, from the beginning of the ſixth century, of " cutting-off from the moſt ſacred books they had, what- " ſoever was not agreeable to the taſte of the Times." P. 49.

This is juſt what the *Jews* are accuſed of; with regard to their altering the *Targums*. *Allix* Jew. Ch. p. 95.

Theſe

These forgeries, Mr. Daillé says, have in a manner borne-down all good and true books; p. 32. Several of them he mentions; and tells us, *Anastasius Bibliothecarius* asserts; that the *Greeks* have corrupted *all* the Councils, except the *first*: p. 52. In this accusation of forgery, he says, the *Greeks* and *Latins* did bandy stiffly against one another; each of them, as may be easily perceived, having more appearance of Reason and Truth in their accusation of their adversary, than in excusing and defending themselves.

"Nor have they contented themselves with *corrupting* "only in this manner some certain books; out of which "we might perhaps have been able to discover, what the "opinion and sense of the ancients have been: but they "have also wholely *abolished* a very great number." Of which he gives several examples; and concludes his fourth Chapter, by saying; that, the several causes he had before mentioned, have rendered the Writings and venerable Monuments of Antiquity so embroiled and perplexed; that it will be a hard matter for any man to make any clear and perfect Discovery of those things, which so many *Artists* have endeavoured to concele from us. P. 68.

XII. p. 46. Mr. *Chillingworth*, in the Preface to his Book, quotes *Hosius*, *Gordonius Huntlæius*, *Gretserus*, *Tannerus*, *Vega*, *Possevin*, *Wickus* and others as so many witnesses to shew, that in the opinion of the *Papists* the modern Doctrine of the Trinity cannot be proved either from the Scripture, or the Ancients.

XIII. p. 51. It is certain; that most of the ancient Fathers, before the Council of *Nice*, have held a Generation of the Word *in tempore*; a little before the Creation of the World: the learned Dr. *Bull* has given us a long list of them. *Just. Mart.* Ap. 2. p. 66. E. Dial. cum

Tryph. p. 285. D. 358, 13. C. 359. B. *Athenag.* Legat. pro Chriſtianis, p. 10. D. *Theoph.* ad *Autol.* p. 88. B. p. 100. B. *Tatian,* p. 145. B. *Clem. Alex.* Strom. v. p. 553. B. 591. B. Strom. vi. p. 644. A. Strom. vii. p. 700. C. *Tertul.* Apol. c. 21. p. 19. contra *Herm.* c. 3. c. 18, 20, 45. adv. *Prax.* c. 5, 7, 12. *Lact.* lib. 2. c. 8. p. 177, 178. l. 4. c. 6. p. 364, 365, 366. Biſhop *Burnet*'s Animadverſions on Mr. *Hill*'s Book, p. 44.

XIV. p. 51. That Chriſt was the Angel of the Covenant is held by *Juſt. Mart.* Dial. cum *Tryph.* p. 275. A. 283. B. and 357. B. C. in *Tertull.* againſt *Prax.* p. 648. in *Novat.* lib. de *Trin. Theoph.* l. 2. ad *Autol.* p. 100. *Tertull.* adv. *Jud.* c. 9. p. 194. adv. *Marcion.* l. 2. c. 27. p. 395, 396. Synod. *Antioch.* Concil. to. 1. Ed. *Lab.* to. 1. p. 845. D. *Euſeb.* Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 1. c. 2.—Quoted in Biſhop *Burnet*'s Animadverſions on Mr. *Hill*'s Book, p. 46. See Letter iii.

XV. p. 52. *Quod ad cætera poſt conſecuta Symbola, quæ in Conciliis Oecumenicis, ut vocantur, cuſa fuerunt; ea, quia recentiora ſunt, cum* his (namely, with the Creeds and Confeſſions of the three firſt Ages) *comparari non merentur. Et ſi, quod res eſt, dicendum eſt; ea ab Epiſcopis inter ſe magna cumæmulatione jurgantibus & contendentibus ex fervore, ſi non furore partiumque ſtudio inſano ac maleferiato,* præcipitata *potius videri debent quam a compoſitis animis profecta.* And he adds; (by which you may underſtand he meaned the *Nicene* Creed particularly) *Quis enim neſcit, quam acres in Synodo* Nicæna *diſceptationes, quam præfracta jurgia inter Epiſcopos excitata fuerint?* Inſtit. Theol. lib. iv. c. 34; *Bulli* Op. Procem. p. 3.

XVI. p. 55, 59, 60, 65, 133. The Schole of *Alexander* in *Egypt,* which was inſtituted by *Ptolemy Philadelphus,* renewed the old Academy or *Platonic* Philoſophy, and reformed

formed it: The firſt famous *Platoniſt* of this Schole ſeems to have been *Potamon*, in the time of *Auguſtus* and *Tiberius Cæſar*. To him we may add *Ammonius*, the Maſter of *Plutarch*, (not the Maſter of *Origen*;) who lived in the Time of *Nero* and *Veſpaſian*. But it flouriſhed moſt under *Ammonius*, (the Maſter of *Origen* and *Plotinus*;) who borrowed his choiceſt Contemplations from the ſacred Scriptures, which he mix'd with his *Platonic* Philoſophiſings: and it is diſputed by *Euſebius* and *Porphyry*, whether he died a Pagan or a Chriſtian. He had great advantages; being bred-up in the ſame Schole with *Philo Judæus*; (ſuppoſed Author of the Book of the Wiſdom of *Solomon*.) Beſides which, there was in the town of *Alexandria* a famous Church, (ſettled by *Mark* the Evangeliſt;) and the Schole was continued by *Pantænus*, *Clemens Alexand.* &c. *Gale*'s Court of the *Gentiles*, p. 42, 253.) And after him ſucceſſively by *Origen*, *Heraclus*, *Dionyſius*, *Athenadore*, *Malcyon*, and *Didymus*; who reached the Year 350: the which Doctors gave an admirable advance to the Church. The town was for this reputed the univerſal Schole of the Church; (*Morellius* of Church Diſc. lib. iii. c. 14. p. 260.) And the *Platonic* Philoſophy was in the higheſt authority among the Fathers. "For it was the common vogue, that it differed little "from *Moſes*; yea, *Cælius Rhodius* thinks, that *Plato* dif-"fers little from Chriſt's Placits." *Gale*, 225. *Hornius* Hiſt. Phil. l. iii. c. 14.

Origen, Scholar to *Ammonius*, though a profeſſed Chriſtian, yet followed his Maſter's ſteps; mixing the *Platonic* Philoſophy and the doctrines of the Goſpel together; hoping thereby to gain credit to the Chriſtian Religion: and, with *Clemens Alexandrinus* and others, made uſe of the *Platonic* and *Pythagoric* Philoſophy, as a medium to illuſtrate the grand myſteries of Faith: thereby to gain credit among thoſe *Platonic* Sophiſts. *Gale*, 265. And F. *Simon* ſays; *La melange de la* Platonicienne *avec la Religion Chrétienne ne tendoit pas a la deſtruction de la Foy orthodoxe*; *mais*

mais a perſuader plus facilement aux Grecs *le Chriſtianiſme*. Hiſt. Crit. du Nouv. Teſt. Tom. iii. This no doubt was the Intent; and it ſucceded as all ſuch methods have done. Among other *Platonic* Myſteries, that of the *Logos*, on which *Ammonius* and *Plotinus*, both Heads of the *Platonic* Schole, had commented, was taken and applied to the divine *Logos* explicated by St. *John*; which gave occaſion and foundation to many philoſophic diſputes and conteſts in the Schole and Church of *Alexandria*, as alſo to the Hereſy of *Arius*; as it had done to that of *Samoſatenus* before. Upon which *Morellius* the *French* Reformer ſays, the *Arian* hereſy had its riſe from the particular conferences of learned men in the city of *Alexandria*; (Diſc. l. 2. c. iv. p. 87.) and *Juſtinian* acquaints us, that theſe philoſophical notions about the *Platonic Logos*, and *Trias*, which ſuppoſed a real difference in Nature between ὁ πατὴρ the Father, ὁ λόγος the *Word*, and ἡ ψυχὴ τῦ κόσμυ, the Soul of the World, gave occaſion to the *Arian* hereſy: (*Juſt.* on John i. 1. and § 8.) and *Athanaſius* himſelf allows, that the Word ἀγέννητος, uſed in the diſpute with the *Arians*, was taken from the *Platoniſts*; and finds fault with the *Arians*, for not uſing it as they (the *Platoniſts*) did. *Cudworth*, 623. In ſhort, there is not the leaſt doubt, that the diſputes upon the Trinity aroſe firſt in this Schole. "Philoſophy and Curioſity, ſays *Morellius*, corrupted this Schole; and by conſequence the Church:" and it is remarkable, that *Alexander*, *Arius*, and *Athanaſius*, were all preferred in that Church.

According to this account of things, Mr. *Gale*, (vol. ii. p. 134) after mentioning ſome of *Origen*'s opinions about the Trinity, a hundred Years before the *Arian* Controverſy, ſays; "Theſe notions about the Trinity, he (*Origen*) imbibed from that *Platonic* philoſophy, then taught in the Schole of *Alexandria* where he was inſtructed; which acknowledged a Trinity, namely, 1. ὁ πατὴρ the Father, whom they made ἀνῶτο ὄν, the ſupreme Being. 2. ὁ νῦς the Mind,

Mind, or ὁ λόγος the Reaſon; whom they made inferior to the firſt: and 3. ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ κόσμου, the Mundane Spirit; which they made inferior to both the former: and hence *Origen* traduced his Trinity," &c.

And this is the more probable, if we conſider what is ſaid by *Dupin*; that before *Origen*'s Time, the word *Trinity* was not known in the Chriſtian Church. For he tells us; that *Theophilus*, Biſhop of *Antioch*, (contemporary with *Origen* and *Clemens*) was the firſt who uſed the Word *Trinity* to ſignify three divine Perſons; and he remarks, that he calls the third *Wiſdom* (*Sageſſe*:) which is the more likely, as the Holy Ghoſt was not ſo ſoon acknowledged to be an *Hypoſtaſis*, or real *Subſtance*; but only an *Attribute*: "It "being more than was acknowledged by the *Nicene* Fa- "thers themſelves; they not ſo much as determining that "the Holy Ghoſt was an *Hypoſtaſis* (or *Perſon*,) much leſs "that he was *God*."

"The Council of *Nice*, ſays Mr. *Souverain*, did not at "all touch upon the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt." Far from it. The Holy Ghoſt was ſo little conſider'd, at that time; that ſome Fathers of the Council would have made no difficulty to give the ſuperiority or precedence to the Virgin *Mary*; in making Her the third Perſon of the *Trinity*. This we learn from *Elmacinus* and *Patricides*. *Hottinger*, Hiſt. Orient. l. 2. p. 227. The Council of *Conſtantinople* did not dare to ſpeak of it; but very indirectly: and in the time of *Baſil*, they were ſhy of calling the Holy Ghoſt directly and formally *God*. It is worth while to hear what *Petavius* ſays upon the Subject. The Catholic Church accommodating itſelf, through prudential Reaſons, to human weakneſs, came not to the full profeſſion of its Doctrines; but by little and little, and by certain degrees. For it had defined nothing in expreſs terms concerning the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, during the four firſt ages; or but a little before. Certainly *Gregory Naz.* excuſes the proceding of St. *Baſil*. (Orat. 20, Ep. 26.) who having

right

right ſentiments of the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, yet for the good of the Church, would by no means call him *God* openly and formally; becauſe he was not ignorant, that there were many, otherwiſe good Catholics; who would be ſcandalized, that *that name* ſhould be given to the Holy Spirit: the uſage of it not being free and public among the Catholics, till after the ſecond general Council held in 381. *Petav.* de Trin. l. 2. c. vii. § 2. *Le Plat. dev.* part 2. c. 12. For the *Pneumatomachi*, who denied the Divinity of the Spirit, were yet the more powerful parts of the Church. Petav. lib. 1. c. xiv. fol. 14 and 21. See alſo *Huetii* Orig. l. 2. c. ii. q. 2. ſect. 10. *Unit. Tr.* tom. ii. p. 18.

And, what is a farther proof of this, the ancient Fathers, when they mention the objections of the Heathens upon this Subject, do not ſpeak of them as levelled againſt the notion of *three* Gods; but of *two* only: whereas, if the notion of the *Divinity* of the Holy Ghoſt had then been faſhionable; they would have made the ſame objection, as is now made by the *Jews* and *Mohammedans*; not againſt *two* Gods, but againſt *three*. I ſhall only quote *Lactantius* Inſt. l. iv. c. xxix. *Fortaſſe quærat hic aliquis*, &c. "Here ſome one may perhaps aſk; how, "though Chriſtians profeſs to worſhip but *one* God, yet "we ſeem to believe and hold *two* Gods; God the *Fa-* "*ther*, and God the *Son*? This doctrine hath been a "great ſtumbling-block to many; who confeſs, that in "*other* points of the Chriſtian doctrine, we ſpeak what "is probable and fit to be embraced; but in *this* they "think we ſtumble, that we hold a *ſecond God*; and him "alſo a mortal one; or one who could die."

Now if the diviſions of the Church were derived from the corruptions of that Schole; (as we are told by *Morelius*, *Juſtinian*, and others:) we ſhall probably underſtand the nature of them the better, by conſidering the ſyſtem of the *Platonic* Trinity; as we are told, that the Chriſtians

tians rather endeavoured to accommodate the Scriptures to the *Platonic* Philoſophy; than by the help of the Scriptures to reform that Philoſophy; tampering betimes rather to bring Chriſtianity down to Philoſophy, than to make Philoſophy truckle under the truth and ſimplicity of the Scriptures: "which Philoſophy being only a ſo-"phiſtication of Religion, proved an effectual door, to "let-in all the errors and antichriſtian abominations, "which have lien in the boſom of the Chriſtian Church "ever ſince." (*Gale*, 265.) What thoſe errors and abominations were, we ſhall beſt conjecture; by underſtanding the *Platonic* ſyſtem.

Porphyry, a Scholar of *Plotinus*, expounding the ſentiments of *Plato*, ſaith; that the Eſſence of God proceeds even to *three Hypoſtaſes:* but that the ſupreme God is τ'ἀγάθὸν, and that after him the ſecond is δημιυργὸ:, the prime Opificer, or Creator; moreover that the third is ἡ ψυχὴ τῦ κόσμυ, the mundane Soul, or univerſal Spirit: for the Divinity extended itſelf to the Soul of the Univerſe. *Cyril. Alexan.* con. *Jul.* lib. i. p. 34. Edit. *Par.* 1638. *Gale*, 383, *&c.*

Theſe three *Hypoſtaſes* were called *Ouranus*, *Chronus* and *Zeus*; three Natures, three Principles, three Gods: and were ſuppoſed all together to be One Θεῖον, *Numen* or *Divinity*. And this word was applied to them all together, and to each of them ſingly; tho' the Father was properly called by them, as well as by the Chriſtians, πηγὴ τῆς Θεὸτήτος, the Fountain of the Godhead: and *Plato* calls him τῦτι ἡγεμόνος καὶ ἀιτίυ παντὸς πατὴρ· the Father of the Prince and cauſe of all things; meaning to ſay, the Father of the ſecond *Hypoſtaſis*. *Cudworth* 385, 588, 407.

The three Hypoſtaſes of *Plato*'s Trinity are not only all *eternal*; bût *neceſſarily exiſtent* and *abſolutely undeſtroyable*. For the firſt can no more exiſt without the ſecond, which is ἀυτοσοφια, the wiſdom by which he himſelf is wiſe; (p.

575.) nor the first and second without the third; than original Light can exist without its splendor or coruscation, or effulgency: and consequently, they are not creatures. *Cudworth*, 577.

And when *Plato* asserts, that the Mind or second *Hypostasis* is γενέτης with the first; it is all one as if he had said, it is συγγενὴς, and ὁμοειδὴς and ὁμογενὴς with it: all which words are used by *Athanasius*, as synonymous with ὁμοούσιος *(coëssential* or *consubstantial.)* In this the *Nicene* Council agreed with the *Platonists*; and differed from *Arius*. And these three *Hypostases* are so closely joined together, as to be *(tantum non)* all-but the same; as the splendor is indivisibly joined with the Sun. They likewise seem to give to their three *Hypostases* such an ἐμπεριχώρησις *circumincession* and mutual *inbeing*, as the Christians do. *Cudworth* 578, 590.

They explain οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, as *Athanasius* and *Cyril* do, to differ only as a Species from an Individual *(Athan.* in his Treatise on the Syn. of *Arim.* and *Seleuc.* vol. i. 934, written towards the latter end of his life, says; ἡ δὲ ὑπόστασις οὐσία ἐστιν καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο σημαινόμενον. Bishop of *Clogher* on Spirit, p. 135.) So that they understood the Essence or Godhead, not to be *singular*, but *generical*; the οὐσια differing from the *Hypostasis*, as τὸ κοινὸν *general* from τὸ καθ ἕκαστον *particular*: each person being supposed to have its *singular numerical* Essence. *Cudworth*, 597. Reply to Dr. Waterland's defence, p. 443. *Ousia* means substance in general, and *Hypostasis particular* substance: as when we speak of Fire *in general*, or a particular Fire: but in both cases it signifies the Substance of Fire. Thus *Thomas* and *John* are of the same *Ousia*; but not of the same *Hypostasis*.

They declare the three Hypostases to be one Divinity or Godhead, because they have an essential and gradual subordination in them; the second being the image of the first, and the third the image of the first and second: whereas were they supposed to be perfectly coëqual, and to have no essential dependence upon one another, they could

could not be concluded by theſe *Platoniſts* to be any other than *three cöordinate* Gods; having only a *generical* or *ſpecifical* identity, and ſo no more one, than *three* Men are one *Man:* a thing, which the *Platonic* philoſophy is utterly abhorrent from; as that which is inconſiſtent with the perfect Monarchy of the Univerſe, and highly derogatory from the honour of the ſupreme God, and firſt cauſe. Their intention in this ſubordination of the *Hypoſtaſes* of their Trinity being no other, than to exclude thereby a plurality of cöordinate and independent Gods; which they ſuppoſed an abſolute cöequality of them would infer. *Cudworth* 590, 595, 596.

Another reaſon given for this gradual ſubordination in the *Platonic* Trinity is mentioned by the learned Biſhop *Ruſt*, in his letter of Reſolution concerning *Origen* and his Opinions; re-publiſhed in the *Phœnix*. That if the ſecond and third *Hypoſtaſis* did receive from a neceſſity of Nature, equal perfection and plenitude in every reſpect from the firſt; then the ſecond and third *Hypoſtaſes* having the *ſame neceſſity* and *plenitude* of Nature, muſt unavoidably produce as many more; and ſo on *ad infinitum:* and the number of the divine *Hypoſtaſes* muſt be infinite; which is abſolutely contrary to the *Platonic* ſyſtem. For,

Plotinus writing againſt ſome *Gnoſtics* of his time, who would make more of theſe divine *Hypoſtaſes* than three; concludes from philoſophical principles, that there can be neither more nor fewer. For, as he argues, having placed firſt, the *ſimple Good*; we muſt ſet the *Mind*, or ſupreme Intellect, next after it; and then the *univerſal Soul* in the third place: for this is the right order, according to Nature; neither to make more intelligibles (or univerſal Principles) nor yet fewer than theſe three. For he that will contract the number, and make fewer of them; muſt of neceſſity ſuppoſe Mind and Soul to be the ſame, or elſe Mind and the firſt Good. But that theſe

three are diverſe from one another, hath been demonſtrated by us: &c. *Cudworth*, 578.

Theſe are the chief Principles of the *Platoniſts* upon this ſubject; and Dr. *Cudworth* ſays, there is nothing in the genuine Doctrine of *Athanaſius*, but what a true and genuine *Platoniſt* would readily ſubſcribe: and that the *Platonic* ſyſtem, with all its Faults, is more agreable to the principles of Chriſtianity and Reaſon; than the Trinity of *Cyril*, *Gregory*, and ſeveral other reputed orthodox Fathers. *Cudworth*, 621.

Nevertheleſs, there are other Chriſtians; who accuſe the Chriſtian *Platoniſts*, and *Origen* in particular, and his followers; as "affecting to reduce the Scriptures, and "make them ſtoop to *Plato*'s Dogma and Schole." (*Huet. Orig.* l. 2. c. ii. *Gale*, p. 266.) and charge them with almoſt all the great corruptions of Chriſtianity. But as he is accuſed by ſome, he is defended by others. So that after all our Examinations upon this ſubject among the Fathers, we are at a loſs to know in general; whether it was *Origen*, that made the Scriptures ſtoop to Philoſophy; or his Adverſaries: and more particularly, what parts of the preſent ſyſtem are the genuine and original Doctrines of Chriſtianity; and what parts are taken from the *Platoniſts*: who believed a Trinity, long before Chriſtianity exiſted.

If we endeavour to trace the Belief of a Trinity as high as we can; we are not to imagine, that *Plato* was the inventer of this Trinity of *Hypoſtaſes*; it being much older than his time: tho' it does not appear, that it was ever before wrought into ſuch a philoſophical ſyſtem; as it was by Him and his followers. *Plotinus* ſays; it appears from *Plato*'s own Writings, that theſe doctrines are not new or of yeſterday; but have been very anciently delivered, tho' obſcurely: *Parmenides* before him having inſiſted on them, and the diſcourſes now extant being only explications of them. Now *Parmenides* was a *Pythagorean*; whence

whence it is probable, that the doctrine of a divine Triad was one of the *Arcana* of that Schole; (*Cudworth*, 546.) and that the oriental maxim which *Pythagoras* brought with him into *Greece*, that God was ἓν καὶ πολλὰ, related to that Doctrine: for the Trinity of *Parmenides* was ἓν τὸ πᾶν, ἓν πάντα, ἓν καὶ πολλά. (*Gale*, 48.) And this is confirmed in that *Numenius* a *Pythagorean* entertained it as such; and *Moderatus* affirms it to be a *Pythagoric Cabbala*; and *Jamblichus* says, there were three Gods praised by the *Pythagoreans*. But farther,

The *Pythagorean* philosophy was derived from the *Orphic Cabbala*; as *Proclus* testifies. (See *Cudworth*, 305, 306.) For *Orpheus* introduced a *Trimorphic* God, a triform Deity; and *Amelius* tells us, that *Plato*'s three Kings were the same with the Trinity of *Orpheus*;—*Phanes*, *Ouranus*, and *Chronus*. But *Plato* nevertheless asserted one self-existent Deity and original of all things; and says, all things were made by one Deity, under these three several names; *Light*, *Council*, and *Life*.

Orpheus, *Pythagoras*, and *Plato* all travelling into *Egypt*, were there initiated in the *arcana* Theology of the *Egyptians*: whence it seems probable, that this was an *Egyptian* doctrine. *Athanasius Kircherus* does not doubt it; and *Jamblichus* mentions the three *Hypostases* by the names of *Eikton*, *Emeph* (or *Cneph*) and *Ptha*. *Cudworth*, 353, 354.

Dr. *Cudworth* observes also some footsteps of a Trinity, in the *Mithraïc* mysteries among the *Persians*; derived from *Zoroaster*: that the *Persian Mithras* was called *triplasios*, (threefold;) and the three *Hypostases* were *Oromasdes*, *Mithras*, and *Arimanes*. And as *Arimanes* signifies ὁ Ἀΐδης or *Pluto*; he observes, that *Pluto* was the third in the *Persian*, as well as in *Homer*'s Trinity; and quotes from these Oracles Παντὶ γὰρ ἐν κόσμῳ λάμπει Τριὰς, ἧς Μονὰς ἄρχει· which by the way is not a Trinity, but a Quaternity, like the Trinity of Peter Lombard. See p. 36.

He

He obſerves alſo a Trinity of Gods among the *Samothracians*; called by a *Hebrew* name *Cabirim*, or the mighty Gods: whence he ſuppoſes, it might be originally derived from the *Hebrews*; and ſays, the *Roman Capitoline* Trinity was from hence derived. 288, 289, 290, 547, 548.

But Sir *Iſ. Newton* ſays; when the myſteries of "*Ceres* "were inſtituted at *Eleuſis*, there were other myſteries "inſtituted to her and her daughter and her daughter's "huſband in the iſland of *Samothrace*, by the *Phœnician* "names of *Dii Cabiri*; *Axieros*, *Axiokerſa*, and *Axioker*-"*ſes*: that is, the great Gods *Ceres*, *Proſerpina*, and "*Pluto*." Chronol. 157.

In like manner it may be obſerved; that a Trinity of Gods in the ſame Family was no uncommon thing. *Thoas* or *Cinyras* was worſhipped in *Egypt*, by the name of *Vulcan* or *Baal Canaan*; and his wife *Calycopis*, the mother of *Æneas*, by the name of *Venus*: the *Dea Cypria* and *Dea Syria* of the ancients: and their ſon *Gingris*, by the name of *Adon* or *Adonis*, the Lord: and in the *Capitoline* Trinity, *Jupiter*, and his wife *Juno*, and his daughter *Minerva*. *Cudworth*, 450. Alſo *Jupiter Ammon*, and his wife *Titæa*, and ſon *Bacchus* or *Oſiris*; and afterwards *Oſiris*, and his wife *Iſis*, and ſon *Orus*. *Newton*'s Chron. 224. So that no argument can be drawn either from the *Hebrew* or *Phœnician* word *Cabirim*, or from the number of *Hypoſtaſes* among the Philoſophers being a Trinity; that it was derived from the *Hebrews*. Lord *Mornay du Pleſſis Marly*, in the 6th Chapters of the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion; the 5th and 6th Chapters of which I met with in a Pamphlet publiſhed by Mr. *Bellamy* in 1721: carries the origin of this Doctrine much higher. His words are theſe. Let us now ſee, what the *Devils* themſelves have been forced to acknowledge: who, either by the aſſiſtance of the ſacred Scriptures, or by having been once the happy inhabitants of the realms of Light above; have had ſome inſight into this important and myſterious

Doctrine:

Doctrine: and certainly it muſt be no ſmall ſatisfaction to obſerve, with what reluctance thoſe reſtleſs, haughty, and obdurate ſpirits have ſubmitted to the irreſiſtible charms of Truth. *Thulis*, an ancient proud monarch of *Egypt*, aſked *Serapis* their chief Dæmon; (and conjured him by all that was ſacred not to deceive him:) what Prince ever had been, or ſhould be greater than himſelf? To whom he anſwered;

Πρῶτα Θεὸς, μετέπειτα Λόγος, καὶ Πνεῦμα σὺν αὐτοῖς,
Πάντα δὲ συμφυτα ταῦτα, καὶ εἰς ἓν ἰοντα τέτυκται,
Οὗ κράτος ἀιώνιον· ποσὶν ὠκέσι, θνητὲ, βάδιζε·
Τὸν βιον ἄδηλον διανύων σῦ πολὺ χρεισσων·

Primus Deus, deinde Verbum, & Spiritus cum his;
Omnia vero cognata illa, & in unum compacta,
Cujus poteſtas æterna: citis pedibus, mortalis, abi;
Vitam qui ignotam tranſegit te potior eſt multo.

It is thus tranſlated; I ſuppoſe, by Mr. *Bellamy:*

Three God-almighties fill Heaven's awful Throne:
The Father ſits ſupreme, next him his Son,
The Spirit laſt: and yet theſe Three are One.
With ſpeed, fond Queriſt, from theſe altars fly:
Too deep, too intricate this Myſtery,
For You to comprehend, or be reſolv'd by Me.

The noble Lord confirms this with another quotation from the oracle of *Apollo*. However, Mr. *Bellamy* ſeems here to have forgotten the *Athanaſian* Creed; that there are not *three* Almighties, but *one* Almighty. What credit is to be given to the Devil, when he is upon his oath, and conjured by all that is ſacred, I ſhall not examine; as the World is now too wiſe to believe a word of the Story.

Dr.

Dr. *Cudworth* ſpeaks of certain ſignifications in the Old Teſtament of *Plurality* in the Deity, or of more than one *Hypoſtaſis*; but in truth there are no ſuch ſignifications: but the Unity of God is aſſerted throughout the whole, as ſtrongly as poſſible; being, as *Maimonides* ſays, *fundamentum fundamentorum*. The God *Jehovah*, the Word of *Jehovah*, and the Spirit of *Jehovah*, are indeed there ſpoken of; but they are ſpoken of as *different* Beings, except where the *Spirit* of God means the *Perſon* of God. There is not the leaſt intimation in the Old Teſtament, that theſe three are *one* Subſtance, Eſſence or Nature; there is no Coëſſentiality or Conſubſtantiality once hinted at. And tho' Mr. *Gale*, p. 48, calls the Pagan Trinity *dim, poor notices* of a Trinity, *weak, corrupt traditions*; it ſeems in truth to be much more clearly ſpoken of as a Trinity in Unity by the *Platoniſts*, and in the Heathen oracles, than any where in the *Jewiſh* Scriptures, or in any divine *Cabbala*, as pretended by *Proclus*, and favoured by Dr. *Cudworth*. For as to any *Cabbala* of authority, there is no ſuch thing.

Dr. *Cudworth* ſays from *Proclus*; it cannot be conceived how ſuch a Trinity of divine *Hypoſtaſes* ſhould be diſcovered by human wit and reaſon; and therefore it muſt be from a divine *Cabbala*. But this is very fallacious; firſt; becauſe, by this Argument, a *falſe* opinion of the Trinity may be proved to be from a divine *Cabbala*; as well as the *true* one: and therefore his *Conſequence* is falſe. Beſides, the Chriſtians argue with great appearance of truth; when they tell us, the reveled Laws of God may be concluded to be *divine*; becauſe they are *agreeable* to thoſe Truths, which he has written in our Breaſts: but they muſt not argue at the ſame time, that others are *divine*; becauſe they are apparently *contrary* to the Truths we find in our own breaſts.—This is inconſiſtent.—But farther, the *Premiſes* in this argument are as falſe as the Con-

Concluſion. For the doctrine of a Trinity is not at all inconceivable; but very eaſy to be accounted-for more ways than one. As firſt,

It might ariſe from Natural Philoſophy; which, as *Cicero* obſerves, was mixed with their Divinity; and formed their Religion. For as the World is naturally divided into Earth, Air, and Sea; the Government of it by three Perſons ſeems to want no other foundation, to become a doctrine among the *Polytheiſts*; even while they were believed by the Unitarians to be the ſame Being. Accordingly, Dr. *Cudworth* ſays; "that *Jupiter*, *Neptune*, and "*Pluto*, were not *three* real diſtinct ſubſtantial beings, but "only ſo many ſeveral *names* for *one* ſupreme God, (accord-"ing to the true and natural Theology of the Pagans) is "thus plainly declared by *Pauſanias* in his *Corinthiacs*: "where he expounds the meaning of a certain Statue of "*Jupiter* with three eyes, called the Country *Jupiter* of "the *Trojans*: *viz.* to ſignify that it is the ſame God "which ruleth in three ſeveral parts of the World; the "Heaven, the Sea, and the Earth." (*Cudworth*, p. 492, and 450.) And thus the triple *Hecate* is conſidered as one Being, acting under different characters; being *Luna* in the Heaven, *Diana* on Earth, and *Proſerpine* in Hell. And hence might ariſe the ſuperſtitious regard to the number *Three*; from whence they feigned *Three* Furies, *Three* infernal Judges, *Three* Fates, *Three* Graces, *Three* Syrens, *Three* Gorgons, *Three* Cyclopes: and uſed it in conjuration, Τρὶς, εἰς ἰσον ἔκτυσα χάλκεον.

But, beſides their Natural Philoſophy, we may conſider their Metaphyſics. Mr. *Souverain* obſerves; that *Thyſius*, in his notes on *Lactantius*, has penetrated to the firſt ſource of this Philoſophy which conſiſts in a Trinity of Principles, from an other reaſon; God, ſays he, créated the World, and adorned it with a thouſand Wonders; that the Spirit of Man contemplating ſo ſurprizing a Work, may admire the *Wiſdom*, the *Goodneſs*, and the *Power* of the great Opi-

ficer. *Le Plat. dev.* p. 55. And these *Attributes* and *Qualities*, being considered as so many Substances; hence arose so many Trinities in Unity. And Dr. *Cudworth* himself is of the same opinion, when he says; "the three *Hypostases* of the *Platonists* do not seem to be any thing else "than infinite *Goodness*, infinite *Wisdom*, and infinite "*Power* and *Love*." *Cudworth*, 590; and again, "We "have proposed the three principal [Properties, or] Attributes of the Deity, says he; the first whereof is infinite Goonness, with Fecundity; the second, infinite "Knowledge and Wisdom; and the last, infinite, active, "and perceptive power. From which three divine Attributes, the *Pythagoreans* and *Platonists* seem to have "framed their Trinity of *Archical Hypostases*; such as have "the nature of Principles in the Universe, *&c.* p. 206." And this foundation being once laid, other Trinities were also invented; which were used in their metaphysical disquisitions. Thus, as I observed, *Orpheus* supposes; all things were made by God, under three names; *Light*, *Council*, and *Life*: *Amelius* considers the Trinity, as he that *is*, he that *has*, and he that *beholds*: 306. and *Proclus Lycius* mentions three Types of God; Bounty, Immutability, and Unity. (*Gale*, 258.) And *Vossius* says of him; that he endeavoured to reduce all things to Trinities, from *Plato*'s Republic. *Lib.* ii. How like is this to the three *modal* distinctions, by which Divines do usually explain the Trinity; *viz.* Life, Understanding, and Will; and St. *Austine*'s Trinity of Mind, Wisdom, and Love? *Unit. Tr.* vol. iv. *Tract* concerning *Emlyn*, p. 6. And Note XXII.——And in this sense *Eusebius* may well be understood; when he complains, that the Pagans did διάζειν τὴν ἄψυχον ὕλην. deify inanimate Nature: for these are the second Gods, which *Athanasius* considers in his book against the *Greeks*; *viz.* the several notions and powers of the supreme God deified. *Cud.* 512, 518, 531. And the Æons of Valentinian were the divine Properties, of which his Fol-

Followers made perſonal Subſtances. Pearſon vindic. of Ignat. pt. 2. c. 5. Gelaſius in annot. in lib. 1. Irenæi.

Mr. *Graverol* in his *Moſes vindicatus*, p. 89, acknowledges; that "whatever is ſaid touching the origin of "Philoſophy, among the *Egyptians*, the *Chaldeans*, and "the *Greeks*, is a very uncertain Tradition; and his "Opinion is, that it was the fruit of their Studies and "Experience." Upon which Mr. *Souverain* ſays; "That "which he advances of Philoſophy in general, is ſtill "more true with regard to the particular ſubject, which "treats of three Principles. For by their long reſearches "into the origin of the World, and not by Tradition, "(unleſs it be a very uncertain and confuſed one) it is, "that they have come to the knowledge of theſe three "principles, Goodneſs, Wiſdom, and Power." *Le Plat. dev.* c. v. And this ſuppoſition is agreeable to the notions of the *Platoniſts* themſelves; in proving the truth of their opinions from the Principle of Philoſophy and Reaſon: which is inconſiſtent with the argument uſed by *Proclus*, to prove a divine *Cabbala*. I ſhall only add; that the moſt learned of the *Platoniſts* did not believe their *Trinity* to be the ſupreme God; but a *Monad* over them: and many of the nations, Dr. *Cudworth* mentions, held a *Duality* of a good and a bad Being. So that the notion of a Trinity was not ſo common, as is repreſented. *Unit. Tracts*, vol. ii. p. 16, 17. much leſs the notion of a Trinity in Unity.

XVII. p. 60. *That the Son was believed to be equal to the Father in* Eſſence *only.*——*Baſil* ſays; though the Son be in *Order* ſecond to the Father, (becauſe *produced* by him;) and in *Dignity* alſo, foraſmuch as the Father is the Cauſe and Principle of his Being: yet he is not, for all that, ſecond in *Nature*; becauſe there is *one* Divinity in *both*. *Baſil.* 3 con. *Eunom. Cudworth*, 607.—And *Auſtine*, writing againſt the *Arians*, ſaith; "though they conceive

"the *Power* of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt to be "unequal; yet let them for all that confeſs, that their "*Natures* are equal at leaſt." *Cud. ibid. Aug. con. Serm. Arian.* c. xviii. And therefore Dr. *Cudworth* ſays; "When *Athanaſius* and the other orthodox Fathers do ſo "frequently aſſert the *Equality* of all the three Perſons, "this is to be underſtood in way of oppoſition to *Arius* "only; who made the Son to be unequal to the Father, "as being ἑτεροούσιος, of a different *Eſſence* from him." *Cud.* p. 600. The equality they mention entirely regarding the *Eſſence*. And in like manner he ſays; "When "the *Athanaſians* quote the tradition of the ancient "Church, and *Origen*'s teſtimony againſt the *Arians*; it "was only to prove the *Eternity* and *Divinity* of the Son: "but not at all for ſuch an *abſolute Coëquality* of him with "the Father, as would exclude all *Dependence* and *Subor-* "*dination*, and *Inferiority*." For it is upon their unanimous agreement in theſe points, that *Petavius* taxes the Fathers with *Platoniſm*, and corrupting the Purity of the Faith. *Cudw.* 595.

And this farther appears, not only from *Athanaſius* himſelf; [who ſometimes ſpeaks in the ſtile of the ancient Fathers, that the Majeſty of the Father is ſuperior to that of the Son; and the Son is viſible, the Father inviſible; upon which *Dupin* obſerves, *mais cela n'empeche point qu'ils ne ſoient de meme* Nature:] (*Athanas. Orat.* 4. *con. Ar. Dupin*, p. 61, note r.) but alſo from the common Metaphors, by which both the *Platoniſts* and *Orthodox* explained their notions; *viz.* "That the ſecond *Hypoſtaſis* was de- "rived from the Father, as Light from the Sun, or "Stream from the Fountain." So *Lactantius* ſays "Both the Father and Son is *God*; but the one, as it "were, an *exuberant Fountain*; the other as a *Stream* de- "rived from it: the former, like the Sun; the latter, "like a Ray extended from the Sun. *Cud.* 606, 609. "*Lactant. Inſt.* lib. iv. c. xxix." And *Athanaſius* himſelf declares, that the three Perſons in the Trinity are not

to

to be looked upon as *three Principles*, nor to be reſembled to *three* Suns; but to the *Sun* and its *Light*, and its *derivative Light*; "ſo, ſays he, we allow but one Princi-"ple(*m*)." For though he uſes the ſame Word, ὁμούσιος *(conſubſtantial)* to expreſs that the Branches are ὁμούσιοι *(conſubſtantial)* with the Vine; and all men are *conſubſtantial* with one another; *Cud.* 606. yet he never ſuppoſes the three Perſons in the Trinity to be *ſeparate*, as three *Men* are; but to be inſeparably conjoined, as the Sun and its Light; ſo that one cannot exiſt without the other. All which expreſſions allow the ſame kind of Subordination, which was maintained by the *Platoniſts*. And therefore Dr. *Cudworth* ſays; "In all this Doctrine of his "*(Athanaſius)*, *viz.* that the three divine *Hypoſtaſes*, "though not *monoouſious*, but *homoouſious* only, are really "but one God, or Divinity; there is nothing but what a "true genuine *Platoniſt* would readily ſubſcribe to. *Cud.* "620." And again; *Plato* expreſsly agrees and ſymbolizes, not with the "Doctrine of *Arius*, but with that of "the *Nicene* Council; nor did they differ much in lan-"guage. *Cud.* 579, 623." They both imagined the *Godhead* to conſiſt in the *Eſſence* or *Subſtance*, which was ſuppoſed the ſame in them all; and, where there was the ſame *generical* Subſtance, the Subſtance muſt be *equal*. And therefore *Petavius*, expounding the *Athanaſian* Creed, writeth in this manner—"The *Father* is in a right Ca-"tholic manner affirmed by moſt of the ancients, to be "*greater* than the *Son*; and he is commonly ſaid alſo, "without reprehenſion, to be *before* him; in reſpect of "Origin. *Petav. de Trin.* 863. *Cudw.* 599." Whereupon He concludeth the true meaning of the Creed to be this: "That no Perſon in the Trinity is greater or leſs "than another, in reſpect of the *Eſſence* of the Godhead "common to them all; becauſe the true Godhead can be

(*m*) Cud. 599. *Athan.* con. *Ar.* orat. 4. p. 467.

"no

" no where greater or leſs; for in *Identity* of *Kind*, there " can be no *Inequality*. *Petav. de Trin.* 863. *Cud.* 599." And Mr. *Herne*, the reputed author of the Remarks on Dr. *Waterland*'s ſecond Defence of his Queries, under the name of *Philalethes Cantab.* ſays; No one Text of Scripture, or Teſtimony of any ancient writer, ever declares the Son to be equal in Power or Dominion to the Father; though the contrary doctrine is frequently taught, in expreſs Terms. p. 61, 62. And to prove this, he quotes from *Tertullian*, *Novatian*, *Pierius*, *Baſil*, *Hyppolytus*, *Euſebius*, &c.

Origen ſays; we affirm that the Son is not *more* powerful, but that he is *leſs* powerful than the Father: and this we affirm, out of a perſuaſion of the truth of his Words; who ſaid, the Father that ſent me is *greater* than I. Con. *Celſ.* lib. viii. p. 288.

Again, we ſay; that our Saviour with the Holy Ghoſt, not only comparatively but ſuper-eminently excels all things that were made [by him]; being yet himſelf excelled by the Father, as much, and even more, than he and the Holy Ghoſt excel the other, and theſe not ordinary [Creatures] neither; but notwithſtanding he who excels ſuch and ſo great Beings in *Eſſence* and *Dignity*, and *Power* and *Godhead*, (for he is the living Word and Wiſdom); is nevertheleſs not in any thing compared to the Father. Con. *Celſ.* lib. viii. p. 388. *Novatian* ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe, and ſays; " If the Son was *inviſible*, if he was *incomprehenſible*, if he was in any other reſpect what the Father is; then we allow it might juſtly be objected, that there are *two* Gods. ch. xxxi. And *Euſebius* ſays; We do not ſuppoſe the two to be *equal* in Honour, nor that they are both of them *unoriginate* and *unbegotten*—And Mr. *Jurieu* proves, that there was no ſuch equality held by the *Antenicene* Fathers. *Emlyn*, vol. ii. p. 260, 278, 280, 284. And the author of the Reply to Dr. *Waterland*'s Defence ſays, (p. 351); " Nor have you produced any one paſ-

" ſage

" ſage of any one writer, even for the firſt 400 Years;
" that agreed or taught with you, that the Son and Holy
" Spirit were *the one ſupreme God*; or *equally ſupreme* with
" the Father in *Authority, Dominion*, and *Worſhip*."

XVIII. p. 64, 106. *Of* Apollinaris.—Lord Chancellor *King*, the reputed author of the Hiſtory of the Apoſtles Creed, with critical Remarks (p. 245) calls him the great *Apollinaris*, the ornament and ſplendor of the Church of that age, the moſt ſignalized champion for the Faith, and an illuſtrious example of Piety and Virtue—by all eſteemed the greateſt man of his age, both for Learning and Piety; a moſt accurate and nervous defender of the Faith againſt all its enemies, whether Heathens or Heretics. *Dupin* ſays; he was beloved and eſteemed by St. *Athanaſius*, St. *Baſil*, St. *Epiphanius*, and all the great men of his age, for Learning and Knowledge. *Baſil* ſays; he has ſuch a reſpect for him, and is ſo much his Friend; that he would take *his* faults upon *himſelf*. *Epiphanius* calls him a venerable old man; and ſays he was cheriſhed by *Athanaſius*, and all the orthodox Biſhops. *Serapion*, Biſhop of *Antioch*, ſtiles him *Claudius Apollinaris*, of bleſſed Memory. *Euſeb.* Eccl. Hiſt. B. v. C. xix. &c. St. *Jerom* ſays, that he had often ſeen him at *Antioch*; that he honoured him, and learned many things of him. *Philoſtorgius*, the *Arian* Hiſtoriographer, ſays; that he, and *Baſil*, and *Gregory Nazianzen*, defended the Divinity of Chriſt better than Any either before or after them; in compariſon of whom the great *Athanaſius* was eſteemed to be but a Child; and the moſt conſidered and eſteemed of theſe three was this *Apollinaris:* and that theſe three were wanting in nothing neceſſary to read and underſtand the Scriptures; and eſpecially this *Apollinaris*, who underſtood the *Hebrew* language. He wrote againſt the *Arians* and other Heretics; and in many volumes overthrew Hereſies, and confuted Errors oppoſite to the Faith; and in thirty large and noble books moſt convincingly

cingly baffled the calumnies of *Porphyry*: and his moral character was as conſpicuous as either *Gregory*'s, or *Baſil*'s. His writings ſurpaſſed in beauty and ſtrength every thing that had been written by *Euſebius*, or any of the Ancients. He was excommunicated by *George* Biſhop of *Laodicea*, the tutelar Saint of the *Engliſh*: for taking the part of *Athanaſius* againſt him—And *Epiphanius* ſays, He ſuffered baniſhment, becauſe he would not aſſent to the *Arians*. Tom. ii. p. 1018. Hær. lxxvii. C. xxiv. But all his writings are now loſt. The Catholicks, ſays *Dupin*, had ſuch a horror for the books of the Heretics, that they would not even preſerve thoſe, which did not regard their Hereſy, and might be uſeful to the Church, (i. e. in plain words, they were more bigotted to Party, than ſtudious to defend Chriſtianity:) for which reaſon we have ſcarce one book of the ancient Heretics.

Is it poſſible to give a plainer proof of the blind Zele, with which the believers of thoſe times were infatuated; or a more ſufficient reaſon, why we ought not to have the worſe opinion of any of the learned of thoſe ages; merely becauſe they where condemned as Heretics? Every age has opinions peculiar to itſelf; which riſe with party zele, and fall with it again. And in the heat of theſe diſputes, the opinion of the great *Apollinaris*, founded upon a knowledge of the *Hebrew* Scriptures; when tried by a Majority of Votes in the Council of *Alexandria*, few of which, and perhaps none of them underſtood the *Hebrew* language; was condemned as heretical: becauſe he did not believe that Chriſt had a *Soul* and a *Spirit* diſtinct and different from the divine *Word* that came down from Heaven.

This Hereſy, ſays the Author of the Critical Hiſtory of the Creed, the Fathers apprehended to be attended with moſt dreadful conſequences: ſome of which he mentions, and their arguments againſt it; and it is amazing

to

to ſee how they trifle. I ſhall lay before you the chief of them, as briefly as I can. And

Firſt, *Epiphanius* and *Athanaſius* argue; that it is impious and blaſphemous, to aſcribe *Deſire* and *Grief* to the divine Nature: and ridiculous, to aſcribe them to inſenſible Matter: therefore they muſt be aſcribed to a *human Soul*. I anſwer; Theſe paſſions are aſcribed in the Old Teſtament to *Jehovah*, who had no human Soul. *Jud.* x. 16, We are told of *Jehovah*, that his Soul was grieved; and *Deut.* xxxii. 29. *Jehovah* wiſhes, Oh that they were wiſe, *&c.* It is not therefore impious and blaſphemous to aſcribe Deſire and Grief to the divine Nature, in the *Old* Teſtament; why then in the *New?*

Secondly, *Vincentius Lirin.* and *Epiphanius* tell us; that if Chriſt had been void of a reaſonable Soul, i. e. beſides the *Logos*; his *Humanity* would have been defective: or he would not have been a perfect *Man*. I anſwer; According to the Scripture language, both of the Old and New Teſtament, a ſpiritual Being in a human form is a *Man*: and therefore *Angels*, without any *human* Souls, when they appeared in a *human* form, were called *Men*. For when we ſpeak of a Soul, or a human Soul, i. e. a Man's Soul; we have no other meaning to the Word, but of a *ſpiritual* Being inhabiting a *human* Body: and therefore every ſpiritual Being, while it inhabits a *human* Body, is the Soul of it; however perfect or imperfect: and no other Soul can be wanting, to make it a perfect Man: and it was in this ſenſe the *Cabaliſts* believed the Angel *Metatron*, the inſtructer of *Moſes*, to be the Soul of the *Meſſias*. See what Vitalis ſays, Epiph. Vol. ii. Hær. lxxvii. c. 23.

Thirdly, *Clemens Romanus* ſays; He *(Chriſt)* gave his Fleſh for our Fleſh, and his Soul for our Soul: But *Clemens Romanus* could not mean this, as an objection to the opinion of *Apollinarius*: for he lived long before him. And *Athanaſius* ſays; that the Body is given for the Body; and the Soul for the Soul. And that one thing cannot

be redeemed by another, that is different therefrom. And *Theodoret* ſays, If God the Word did not aſſume the human Soul, he could neither relieve it nor honour it. But where do we find any of theſe pretty Fanſies in the Scripture? They are nothing but mere Conjectures; and, if they were true, the conſequence would be, that the Divinity of Chriſt had nothing at all to do in our Redemption; but the Body of Chriſt redeemed the Body of Man; and the Soul, the Soul. But if the Divinity be conſidered under the general notion of a Spirit; then, even according to theſe Doctrines, there could be no need of any other Spirit; the Divine Nature ſupplying the want of it. For *Vinc. Lirin.* tells us; that, according to the *Apollinarian* notion, ἀρκέσαι τὴν θείαν φύσιν εἰς τὸ πληρῶσαι τοῦ νοῦ τὴν χρείαν, the Divine Nature ſupplied the want of a Soul: and as to the Redemption *of* the Body; the text which ſpeaks of it is interpreted by ſome in a very different manner, *viz. from* the Body. (See Dr. *Sykes* on Redemption.)

But, Fourthly, the chief Argument which they truſted to was this; that Chriſt deſcended into *Hell.* (*Pſ.* xvi. 10. For thou wilt not leave my *Soul* in *Hell*; neither wilt thou ſuffer thine holy one to ſee Corruption: quoted *Acts* ii. 27. and xiii. 35.) and that could not be his *Deity*; becauſe that is omnipreſent, and was in *Hell* before, as well as elſewhere; and could not make a local tranſition thither.—'Tis manifeſt, this argument proves equally againſt the deſcent of the *Logos* from *Heaven*; as againſt his deſcent into *Hell.*

However, 'tis probable; that all theſe arguments were anſwered by the *Apollinariſts*: for it was thought better afterwards to argue, "That the Godhead did deſcend "into *Hell*, accompanying his Soul thither; and from "thence delivered the captive Souls, broke the ſting of "Death, rent in ſunder thoſe bars and adamantine "chains; and by his power looſened the bands of *Hell*, "not

" not ſuffering his Fleſh to ſee Corruption; (*Epiph.* adv. " Hær. lib. 3. Compend. Fid. Cath. p. 463, & 465.) " and at his ſight the Porters of *Hell* trembled. (See the " Confeſſion of the *Arians* at *Ariminum*, *ap. Socr.* Hiſt. lib. " ii. ch. xxvii. p. 133.)"

Upon this a very ſerious and orthodox writer ſays; When I read the place in *Job*, out of the LXX (*Job.* xxxviii. 17) Ἀνοίγονται σοὶ φόβῳ πυλαὶ θανάτου· πυλωροὶ δὲ ᾅδου ἰδόντες σε ἔπτηξαν· and *theſe* expreſſions in the old Symbols or Creeds; I hear methinks *Virgil* ſpeaking of *Hercules*, and ſaying, *Te Stygii tremuere lacus, Te janitor Orci*——But, let the Original of that opinion be what it will; it is certain, that the New Teſtament has not a Word about it.

To this argument of the Fathers it may be anſwered; If the Divinity of Chriſt could accompany his Soul into *Hell*, it might certainly go thither by itſelf.—But in truth, the word *Hell*, which they build upon, in this text means only the Grave, and in general the place of departed Souls. Colomeſius obſerves, that ſome Chriſtians uſed it in the beginning of the Lord's prayer; πατὴρ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν Ἅιδῃ Keimel. Liter. and the word Soul reſpects particularly neither Soul nor Body; and ψυχὴ the Soul, means a perſon either dead or alive. See Note XXX. and *Pearſon*, p. 232; and the ſenſe of the words is only this, that Chriſt ſhould not be left in the *Grave*; but riſe again before the putrefaction of the Body.

You ſee by this, how little danger there was in the opinion of *Apollinaris*; and how little the Fathers had to ſay againſt it. And therefore it is no wonder; that a Doctrine, ſo agreeable to Scripture and Reaſon, continued among the Chriſtians in after-times, and appeared in different ſhapes; and particularly among the *Monothelites*: whoſe Hereſy, as it is called, in believing that Chriſt had but one *Will*, was a natural conſequence of believing him to be one *Perſon*; in whom the *Logos* ſupplied the place of the human Soul: one *Spirit* being ſufficient for one *Perſon*.

And though this opinion was alſo condemned in the ſixth general Council of *Conſtantinople* (in 680); and they who held it were baniſhed from that city, in conſequence of this condemnation; yet it could not be much to their diſhonour, if it be conſidered; that the *Roman* Biſhops, who condemned them, were ſo ſhamefully ignorant; that the Pope himſelf wrote to the Emperor "to excuſe their igno-"rance of the languages and of the holy Scriptures; and "tells him, he was forced to ſend to *England* for a Di-"vine: having no Perſon in *Italy* fit to appear in that "Quality at the Council. And this is written not only "in behalf of his own Legates; but of the Deputies of the "Synod. If this ignorance prevailed to ſo high a degree "among the Clergy at *Rome*; in what a darkneſs muſt "the common people be involved! and yet ſuch as theſe "ſays the hiſtorian, have been choſen to decide the moſt "important controverſies relating to the Salvation of "Mankind: who were implicitly obliged to ſubmit to "their deciſions. *Echard*'s Roman Hiſtory, vol. iv. p. "333."

XIX. p. 66. *Bernard Gilpin*, kinſman to Biſhop *Tonſtal*, ſays of him; *Memini* Tonſtallum *epiſcopum ſæpe narraſſe*, Innoccentium *tertium* inconſulte feciſſe; *quòd* Tranſubſtantiationis *opinionem articulum fidei feciſſet*, Vit. Bern. Gilp. p. 40. And again: *Illud etiam idem* Tonſtallus *ex ſcriptis & ſermonibus affirmare ſolebat*; Innocentium *tertium neſciſſe quid ageret. quando* Tranſubſtantiationem *inter articulos fidei poſuerit*: *dicebatque*, Innocentium *doctis hominibus circa ſe caruiſſe*, p. 46.

XX. p. 66, 67. This fourth *Lateran* Council, called by the *Romaniſts* the twelv'th general Council, was more truely *general*; than almoſt any of thoſe that were ſo called. There were preſent 1200 Fathers; the Ambaſſadors of the Emperor of *Conſtantinople*, the King of the *Romans*, the

the Kings of *France*, *Arragon*, *England*, *Hungary*, *Jeruſalem*, *Cyprus*, and diverſe others; alſo the five *Patriarchs*, partly in perſon and partly by their legates; *viz.* of *Rome*, *Conſtantinople*, *Jeruſalem*, *Antioch*, and *Alexandria*.

See Note 94 on *Joachim*'s doctrine in *Moſheim's Cudworth*, p. 717. [*Lateranenſi.*] *Concilium ſine dubio intelligit* Lateranenſe 14 *generale*, *quod auſpiciis* Innocentii III. A. MCCXV. *cœactum eſt*. *Acta exſtant apud* Jo. Harduinum Concilior. tom. iii. p. 1. *Abbas* Joachimus *tunc temporis ſimile quid ejus decreverat*, *quod paulo ante* Cudworthus *nonnullos antiquorum Theologorum docuiſſe refert*; unitatem *nimirum* Eſſentiæ trium perſonarum veram eſſe ſimplicem ac realem *negaverat*: *contra*, unitatem tantum concordiæ *in Deo eſſe aſſeveraverat*; *ſicut* multi homines, unus populus *et* multi fideles, una Eccleſia *dicuntur V*, Natalis Alexander, Hiſtoriæ Eccleſ. ſæc. xiii. cap. iii. art. iii. p. 77. et diſſ. ii. ad ſæc. xiii. p. 331. *Hunc quo retunderet errorem* Lateranenſe *concilium primo decreto ſic ſtatim ſanxit*: *Firmiter credimus*, *& ſimpliciter confitemur*; *quod unus ſolus eſt verus Deus*,—*Pater & Filius & Sp. S. tres quidem perſonæ ſed una eſſentia*, *ſubſtantia*, *ſeu natura ſimplex omnino*. *Et lege ſecunda iidem antiſtites hoc modo decernunt*. *Nos autem*, *ſacro et univerſali concilio approbante*, *credimus & confitemur*; *cum* Petro; *quod una quædam ſummares eſt*, *incomprehenſibilis quidem et ineffabilis*, *quæ veraciter eſt Pater*, *Filius & Sp. S. tres ſimul Perſonæ de ſingularis quælibet earundem*. *Et ideo in Deo Trinitas eſt ſolummodo*, *non Quaternitas*; *quia quælibet trium Perſonarum eſt illa res*, *viz. Subſtantia*, *Eſſentia*, *ſive Divina Natura*, *quæ ſola eſt Univerſorum Principium*: *præter quod aliud inveniri non poteſt*.

XXI. p. 66, 84. The different Trinities mentioned by Biſhop *Stillingfleet*, from the *Unitarian* Tracts, are theſe—

Firſt, The *Ciceronian* Trinity; ſo called, becauſe *Cicero* had uſed the word *Perſonæ* for different reſpects; *ſuſtinco tres Perſonas*: and, according to this acceptation, three

Perſons

Perſons are no more than three Relations, Capacities, or Reſpects of God to his Creatures: which, the objectors ſay, is downright *Sabellianiſm*.

Second, The *Carteſian* Trinity; which maketh three divine Perſons, or three infinite Minds, Spirits, or Beings, to be one God. This is objected to: as being either a God, compounded of three Perſons; or elſe three Gods.

Third, The *Platonic* Trinity, of three divine co-eternal Perſons; whereof the ſecond and third are ſubordinate and inferior to the firſt, in Dignity, Power, and all other Qualities, except only Duration. This is objected to, as being *Arianiſm*.

Fourth, The *Ariſtotelian* Trinity; which ſaith, the divine Perſons are one God; becauſe they have one and the ſame *numerical* Subſtance. This is objected to, as deſtroying the Perſonality of the Son and Holy Ghoſt; and as never held in the Church, till the year 1215.

Fifth, The Trinity of the *Mobile*; which is held by the common People, or by ſuch lazy Divines, as only ſay in ſhort, that it is an inconceivable Myſtery; and that thoſe are as much in fault, who go about to explain it; as thoſe who oppoſe it. *Stillingfleet*'s Vind. of the Trin. Pref. p. 5. *Bennet*'s Iren. p. 79.

XXII. p. 71. *The Trinity of St. Auſtine, and the reformed Churches abroad.* From the Unitarian Tracts, vol. iv. Tract. 7. p. 24. and p. 4. *ibid.*——A divine Perſon is the divine Eſſence particularly conſidered with, and diſtinguiſhed by, an eſſential Property. The Property, which according to the order of Nature obtains the firſt rank in the conſideration of Deity, is *infinite and perfect Intelligence*. God then, conſidered as an eternal ſelf-exiſting, ſelf-living, and all perfect Intelligence, is the *Father*; or firſt *Perſon* of the Trinity.

Now it is the Nature of a perfect intelligent Underſtanding *to reflect*; and by this reflection of the Intellect

is

is produced a *Wiſdom*, commenſurate to the Underſtanding whence it is derived. And ſo this Wiſdom manifeſtly is the offspring of the Mind. God [i. e. the ſame ſingular Eſſence] conſidered with this God-like Property, is called the *Son*; and ſecond *Perſon*.

In fine, the two aforeſaid divine Properties naturally produce the divine Will or Love, by which God loves his infinite Perfections. And the divine Eſſence conſidered with this Property, is the *Spirit*; and third *Perſon*.

This is St. *Au'ſtine*'s explication; and thus the *Perſons* are particularly explained by the reformed Churches abroad. See the Confeſſion of Faith of the Proteſtant *Gallican* Church, Art. 6. and *Calvin*'s Catechiſm, Sunday the third; and his Inſtitut. l. i. c. xiii. § 18. where he ſays, *Mens uniuſcujuſque eò ſponte inclinat; ut primo* Deum *conſideret, deinde emergentem ex eo* Sapientiam, *tum poſtremo* Virtutem *qua conſilii ſui decreta exequitur*. And according to this are the *modal* diſtinctions, by which Divines do uſually explain the Trinity; *viz.* Life, Underſtanding, and Will; and St. *Au'ſtine*'s Trinity, of Mind, Wiſdom, and Love. Unit. Tr. vol. iv. Tr. 8. p. 6. Compare this with the Notions of the *Platoniſts*, Note xvi. p. 113.——Now, by this way of arguing, every Man is a *Trinity* of himſelf: for he has the immaterial *Eſſence*, with the Property of *Intelligence*; and he can reflect, and produce a *Wiſdom*; commenſurate to the Underſtanding, whence it is derived: and theſe two Properties may produce the human *Will*, or *Love*; by which Man loves his own finite Perfections.——But will a man pretend, that theſe are three real Perſons? Will he imagine it poſſible, that the ſecond of theſe Perſons ſhould ſuffer and die? Can Wiſdom ſuffer? All this is nothing, at the bottom; but what Dr. *Cudworth* would call *Sabellian Jargonry*. It is μία ὑπόστασις τριπροσώπος, and ἓν τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ. In the ſame ſtile the *French* Confeſſion ſays; the Father is the Cauſe of all, the Son is his Wiſdom and Word, the Holy Spirit his Virtue and Power. So the *Belgic*. And the *Poliſh* ſays,

ſays, We call the Father God; who begat his only begotten Son, by whom from Eternity he foreknew all things. So the Son is repreſented as the Father's Intellect. *Emlyn.* vol. ii. p. 225. See Unit. Tracts, vol v. Tr. 5. p. 20.

XXIII. p. 73. The Biſhops chiefly concerned in this wrangle, were *Euſebius Pamphili*, and *Euſtathius* of *Antioch*; *dum ille Euſtathio ſuiſque* ὁμοούσιον *aſſerentibus Montaniſmum & Sabellianiſmum exprobrarent*; *hi vero iſtis Ethnicorum* πολυθεότητα *objicerent.* Bulli Op. 31. falſely printed 28.

XXIV. p. 85. *From* Chillingworth.——I deſire you to vindicate from Contradiction the following Aſſertions: that there ſhould be length, and nothing long; breadth, and nothing broad; thickneſs, and nothing thick, &c. that is, that there ſhould be a long, broad, thick, white, round, heavy, ſweet, moiſt, flowing, active, paſſive *Nothing*. *Rel.* of *Prot.* ch. v. § 46.

XXV. p. 95. *Hilary de Trin.* lib. 10.——*Homo ille de Deo eſt, habens ad* patiendum *quidem Corpus; ſed Naturam non habens ad* dolendum—*In quem quamvis ictus incideret, aut vulnus deſcenderet,* &c. *afferrent quidem hæc* impetum *paſſionis, ſed non* dolorem *paſſionis inferrent.*

This Man is from God; having a Body capable of ſuffering, but not a *Nature* to *feel pain.*—On whom, though Blows might fall, &c. they brought the Violence of Paſſion, but not the Pain of it. As when a Sword is thruſt through the Water, &c. He repeats the ſame, in ſeveral places; as in his Comment on *Pſ.* liii. The Paſſion of Chriſt was undergone by Him voluntarily; to make an Acknowledgement, that Pain was due; not that He who ſuffered was at all touched by this; *non tamen pœnæ ſenſu læſura patientem:* and on *Pſ.* cxxxviii. Chriſt is thought to have felt Pain, becauſe he ſuffered; but he

was

was really free from all Pain, becauſe he is God. Do but think now, ſays *Daillé*, whereunto all this tendeth: and what will become of our Salvation; if the *Paſſion* of our Saviour Chriſt, which is the only foundation whereon it is built, were but a mere *imaginary* Paſſion; without any ſenſe of Pain at all? (*Uſe of the Fathers*, Part 2. p. 80.) The more modern Syſtem is, that *God* ſuffered; but not in his own Nature. But *Juſtin Martyr*, p. 15. who had not learned to deny the Suffering of that Son of God, who deſcended from Heaven; tells us the true Scripture Doctrine——That he ſweat, as it were, great drops of Blood; praying that the Cup might paſs from him, *cum videlicet trepidaret cor ejus & oſſa ſimiliter*; &c. *ut ſciremus Patrem in tantis perpeſſionibus filium ſuum vere noſtra cauſa verſari voluiſſe*; *& non diceremus, illum, quod Dei filius eſſet, non ſenſiſſe ea quæ illi allata ſunt & acciderunt.* Lond. edit. p. 361, 362.

XXVI. p. 102. *Ignatius*, in his Epiſt. to the *Philadelphians*, ſays;——ἐάν τις τᾶυτα μὲν ὁμολογῇ, καὶ ὅτι Θεὸς Λόγος ἐν ἀνθρωπίνῳ σώματι κατῴκει, ὢν ἐν ἀυτῷ ὁ Λόγος; ὡς ψυχὴ ἐν σώματι, διὰ τὸ ἔνοικον εἶναι Θεὸν, ἀλλ' ἐκ ἀνθρωπείαν ψυχήν.

The opinion of *Apollinaris*, according to *Auſtine*, was; that Chriſt aſſumed *Fleſh*, without a *Soul*. *Hær.* 55. p. 182.—That he had not a human or rational Soul; as *Caſſian* words it: that, inſtead of it, the Divinity ſupplied its place and room. He believed, that Chriſt had an *animal Spirit*; but not a *rational Soul*: and the *Arians* believed, he had *neither*. See *Facund.* l. ix. c. 3. *Pearſon* on the Creed, 238. Crit. Hiſt. of the Apoſtles Creed, 245. See *Epiph.* Vol. II. p. 1018.

Theodoret ſays, Ἀρεῖος καὶ Εὐνόμιος—ἔφασαν—τὴν Θειότητα τῆς ψυχῆς ἐνεργεῖναι τὴν χρείαν. Divin. Dec. Epiſt. c. 12. p. 124. and *Athanaſius* ſays of *Arius*, ἀντὶ τᾶ ἔσωθεν ἐν ἡμῖν ἀνθρώπε νᾶς ἐπεράπος ἐν Χριςῷ. Tom. I. de Incar. Chriſti, adv. Apol. p. 628. See *Dupin* Nouv. Bibl. Vol. ii. 125.

Eunomius says of Christ; ἀναλαβόντα τὸν ἐξ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἄνθρωπον· That he took on him Man, consisting of Soul and Body. *Fabrit.* Bib. *Græ.* Vol. viii. p. 257. But we are referred to a Note in p. 250, and told; that this must be understood, according to the Heresy of *Apollinaris*; that by ψυχὴ we are not to understand *Mens*; but the inferior *Anima*, consisting in the Senses; which learned Men may talk-of as they please, but know nothing of it; or whether there be any such thing.

XXVII. p. 105. *Quinam sunt enim illi, qui nobis Biblicæ volumina sarta tecta servavere; nisi* Judæi? *quot menda Scriptionis in sacrum codicem irrepsissent; si illius custodia solis* Lactantiis, Augustinis, Gregoriis, Chrysostomis, *viris sanctissimis, sed imperitis* Hebraismi, *mandata fuisset? inter* Græcos *omnes* Latinos*que qui veterem ecclesiam rexere, unus* Origines *cum* Hieronymo *Hebraice scivit; & forme nimium dixi, ne elementa quidem didicerat.* Cunæus *de Rep.* Hebr. p. 117.

XXVIII. p. 105. *Hic Deus* unus *est, non duo aut plures duobus, sed unicus; cujus* Unitas *non est similis individuis, quæ reperiuntur in mundo: nec unus est* Specie, *complectens plura individua: neque unus* Corpore, *quod est divisibile in partes atque extrema; sed ita unus est, ut nulla unitas similis isti in mundo reperiatur.* Maimon. de Fundam. Leg. § 4.

XXIX. p. 63. *Of the* Athanasian *Creed; which Dr.* Whitby *calls the* Pseudo-athanasian *Creed.*——Dr. *Cudworth* says; "As to that Creed, which is commonly "called *Athanasian*; which was written a long time after "[*Athanasius*], by some other Hand; since at first it de-"rived all its Authority, either from the name of *Atha-"nasius*, from whom it is entitled; or else becaufe it was "supposed to be an Epitome and Abridgement of his "Doctrine; this I conceive is therefore to be interpreted, "according to the Tenor of that Doctrine contained in

"the

" the genuine writings of *Athanaſius*. *Intel. Syſ.* p. 620." The Author of the Creed is unknown; and what Language it was written in. See *Cave*'s Hiſt. Lit. 146; and the diſcourſe of the *Benedictines* on it, in their Edition of the Works of *Athan.* Tom. II. p. 719. Archbiſhop *Tillotſon* wiſhes the Church was well rid of it. It is written upon the principles of *Cyril*, and not on thoſe of *Athanaſius*; for it ſpeaks of the three Perſons exiſting *ſeparately*, as *God* and *Lord*: whereas the Doctrine of *Athanaſius* conſidered them as *inſeparately* conjoined. And Dr. *Waterland*, who is looked upon to be orthodox by many, abſolutely contradicts it. For the Creed ſays, " We are compelled " by the Chriſtian Verity, to acknowledge every Perſon by " himſelf to be God and Lord;" but Dr. *Waterland* ſays, " *No One* Perſon is God; excluſively of the *other Two*." *Defence* of his Quær. 349. *Reply* to his Defence, 438.

And it is drawn according to a Maxim of the *Platoniſts*; which, we are told by *Le Clerc*, the Fathers uſed to imitate; *viz.* that they uſed contrary and oppoſite Terms, when ſpeaking of the ſame thing; aſſerting it in one ſenſe, and denying it in another. *Bib. Univ.* & *Hiſt.* Vol. II. p. 214. Χρῆται γὰρ τοῖς ἐναντίοις φωναῖς ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ· τὸ γὰρ ὂν αἰσθητὸν καὶ ὂν καλεῖ καὶ μὴ ὄν, ſays *Diog. Laërt.* of *Plato*: ὂν μὲν, διὰ τὸ γίνεσιν ἀυτῶ εἶναι. μὴ ὂν δὲ, διὰ τὴν συνεχῆ μεταβολήν. The objects of Senſe both are, and are not; they are, becauſe they are made; they are not, becauſe of their continual change. *Le Clerc* inſtances as follows; " *c'eſt ainſi que nous diſons, qu'il n'y a que* Jeſus Chriſt *qui ſoit mediateur; ſans en exclure neantmoins les miniſtres ordinaires qui le ſont auſſi.*" The Word being applied to them, in a leſs excellent and proper ſenſe; which properly and in the ſtrict ſenſe could only be applied to Chriſt. There are many inſtances of this manner of writing, in Mr. *Ralph Venner*'s Orthodox Parodoxes; publiſhed in 1650: *Ex. gr.* " a Believer believes, that the Father is not the Son; and yet, that whatever the Father is, the Son is the ſame—He believes, that God hath no Form; and yet, that Chriſt ap-

peared in the Form of God—He believes, that God will not acquit the wicked; and yet, that God juſtifies the ungodly." And indeed, I think, no one ſcruples to ſpeak in this manner: for it is nothing more than aſſerting a thing in a lax Senſe, and denying it in a ſtricter one. Thus *Luke* ix. 18. And it came to paſs, as he was *alone* praying, that his Diſciples were with him. Here, in the lax ſenſe of the Word *alone*, as it ſignifies apart from the multitude, the Propoſition is true; but in the ſtrict ſenſe of it, as it ſignifies *by one's ſelf*, it is a direct contradiction. Now all ſuch Propoſitions may be either aſſerted or denied, according to the ſenſe they are taken in; or aſſerted in one ſenſe, and denied in the other. Thus we find it aſſerted, *Mark* xii. 29, 32. that there is but one Lord; and in *Hoſea*, xii. 4. There is no God but me; and no Saviour beſides Me: and yet in the ſame chapter of St. *Mark*, the Apoſtle makes no ſcruple of mentioning another Lord, verſe 36; the Lord ſaid unto my Lord: and St. *Thomas* confeſſes another Perſon to be his Lord and his God; and St. *Paul* tells us of another who is the Saviour; *Tit.* iii. 4, 6. Now why ſhould not all theſe ſeeming contradictions be explained in the ſame manner?

And thus, though there is but one God, in the ſenſe of the Word *Jehovah*, the ſelf-exiſtent God; yet the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt may be all of them called ſo, in the larger ſenſe of the word *Elohim* or *Adonai:* and yet it may be as improper to ſay, they are three Gods, or a Trinity of Gods; as to ſay there are two Lords, or two Saviours. In like manner, it is proper to ſay; that *Jehovah* is God, and *Moſes* was a God to *Pharaoh:* yet by no means proper to ſay, that *Jehovah* and *Moſes* were *two Gods:* becauſe the Word *God*, in the two Propoſitions, is not to be underſtood in the ſame ſenſe. And it is upon this account that *Tertullian* ſays; "Though he might call the Son "*God*, ſpeaking of him *alone*; yet ſpeaking of him with "the

" the Father, he would not name him ſo at the ſame time " with Him; but would call only the Father *God*, and " the Son *Lord*," *Contr.* Prax. c. 13. *Bull*, 252. And this is the Senſe, in which *Philo* calls the *Logos* a ſecond God: in which he was followed by ſome of the Chriſtian Fathers. But they did not mean, that he was a ſecond ſelf-exiſtent Being; but uſed the word *God* of a Being, whom they allowed to be originate and begotten. And it does not appear, that Dr. *Cudworth* could have any other reaſon than this for telling us; that " though it be allowable to ſpeak of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, each of them as *God*; yet is it not allowable to ſpeak of a Trinity of Gods: or what other reaſon St. *Auſtine* could have, as the foundation of *his* remark; that *Philoſophers* uſed free language, but *Chriſtians* are tied-up to phraſes on this occaſion; and ought to ſpeak by a certain Rule." *Cud.* 550. 'Tis true, theſe things are ſo. but what is this Rule? and how came it to paſs, that one of theſe ways of ſpeaking is allowable; and the other not? If the Words have the ſame Meaning, why ſhould not the Chriſtians have the liberty of confeſſing their Belief in any Words that will expreſs their Thoughts? and if no reaſon can be given, it looks as if the Chriſtians allowed *three* Gods in *Fact*; but did not dare to ſay ſo. And there is no wonder, that *Mahomet* and the *Moors* underſtood it ſo. But this is not the Caſe: they believe but *one* God. And therefore, though theſe learned men give no reaſon for it, there muſt be a reaſon; and the different ſenſe of the Word *God*, as it is uſed in Scripture, ſupplies us with a very plain one; and completely anſwers the Difficulty. In any other ſenſe, the Propoſitions of the Creed are abſolute Contradictions; as will appear by what follows. Mr. *Tho. Bennet*, in a Book called *a Confutation of Popery*, has endeavoured to get clear of this Objection. He ſays; " If Revelation ſhould ſay, that *Three are One*; in the " ſame reſpect that Reaſon ſays, that *Three are not One*;

" then

" then Reaſon and Revelation would certainly contradict " each other. But this we do not find: for Revelation " ſays, that Three *Perſons* are One, in *Eſſence*;" [not that Revelation ever does ſay ſo; but this Mr. *Bennet* aſſumes to be the caſe, in order to make good his argument:] and " Reaſon ſays, that Three *Perſons* are not " One, in *Perſon*; and therefore the ſeveral Dictates of " Reaſon and Revelation are very conſiſtent with each " other—becauſe it is no contradiction to ſay, that the " ſame thing may be *Three*, in one reſpect; and *One*, in " another." p. 149.—This anſwer is very far from reaching the difficulty. It is allowed; that the ſame thing may be *Three* in one reſpect, and *One in* another. *e. g.* Three Men may be one Company; three Lines one Triangle; three Rooms one Houſe; but this is only calling the Parts by one name, and the Whole by another: The difficulty of the *Pſeudo-athanaſian* Doctrine is very different; (for the Son and Holy Spirit are not parts of God:) *viz.* How three Perſons, each of them *ſingly* ſupreme God, ſhall be *altogether* but one ſupreme God. This is not like ſaying, three Men are one Company, *&c.* but it is a direct aſſertion, that Three are One; in *the ſame*, and not in *a different* reſpect, as Mr. *Bennet* ſuggeſts; *viz.* That three Lines are one Line, three Men one Man, and three Gods one God: which is a contradiction in *Terms*, as well as in *Nature*; and in every Senſe, except the Word *ſupreme* be omitted; and the Word *God* be underſtood, as it is uſed in Scripture, ſometimes to ſignify *Jehovah*, and ſometimes *Elohim:* and in this Senſe, the Words of the *Athanaſian* Creed are ſcriptural and conſiſtent. But the *Pſeudo-athanaſian* Doctrine can be true in no ſenſe at all.

XXX. p. 127. The *Hebrew* word נפש, as well as the *Greek* ψυχὴ, are ſtill more indeterminate; as appears from *Numb.* vi. 6. He ſhall come at no dead *Body*; which literally tranſlated by *Ainſworth*, is, " He ſhall not come at

" a

"a dead *Soul.*"—So *Levit.* xix. 28. xxi. 11. xxii. 4. *Numb.* v. 2. what is tranſlated the dead or the dead *Body*, is, in the original, *Soul.* So *Hag.* xi. 13. what the LXX. call ἀκάθαρτος ἐπὶ ψυχῇ is rightly tranſlated, one that is unclean by a dead *Body.* Though in other places נֶפֶשׁ ſignify the *Soul*, yet in theſe it muſt be taken for *Body.* *Pearſon*, p. 232. where this is more fully conſidered. In like manner though the word *Chriſt* ſhould ſometimes mean a compound Being, God and Man; yet when we ſpeak of his *Suffering*, it muſt be conſidered in a more determinate manner; whether *both* God and Man ſuffered; or whether it was only *one* of them; and *which* of the two; the Being or Part which was capable of ſuffering, or the Being which was incapable.

XXXI. p. 137. *Of the* Unity.———The following, I think, are all the expreſſions in the New Teſtament; which ſeem to aſſert a Unity between God and Chriſt: and all of them agree in a *figurative* Unity, *i. e.* a Unity of *Will* and *Teſtimony*, &c. as explained by *Calvin* on *John* x. 30. and *Beza* on 1 *John* v. 7. Unit. Tr. vol. iv. *Emlyn*'s Humble Enquiry, p. 47. *&c.* but cannot poſſibly all of them relate to *Perſon* or *Subſtance.* Firſt, 1 *Jo.* v. 7, 8. It is ſaid; theſe three, *viz.* Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are *One* (ΕΝ, one *thing.*) Now, ſuppoſing this Text to be *genuine*, the Meaning is; that they are *One* in *Teſtimony*; for to this purpoſe they are ſpoken of; and not in regard of *Subſtance* or *Perſon:* not Unity of *Subſtance*; for then the Word Οὐσία, or *Hypoſtaſis*, or ſome other word ſignifying *Subſtance*, would have been expreſſed: and not *Perſon*; for then it would not have been ΕΝ, but ΕΙΣ. But moſt probably the text is *ſpurious.* See Sir *Iſaac Newton*'s Letter to Mr. *Le Clerc.*

Second, *Jo.* xvii. 21. Chriſt prays, that the Diſciples may be ΕΝ, one *Thing:* and this Unity is ſo explained in the context, as can only mean a *figurative* Unity; or a Unity

Unity of *Will*, *Conſent*, *Glory*, &c. and not of *Subſtance* or *Perſon*. "Neither pray I for Theſe alone; but for them alſo, which ſhall believe on Me through Their Word: that They all may be *one*, (ἓν, one *Thing*; not one *Subſtance*;) as Thou Father art in Me, and I in Thee: that They alſo may be *one* [ἓν] with Us; that the World may believe, that Thou haſt ſent Me. And the Glory, which Thou gaveſt Me, have I given Them; that They may be *one* [ἓν], even as We are *one* [ἓν.] I in them, and Thou in Me; that They may be made perfect in *one* (thing, εἰς ἓν·) that the World may know, that Thou haſt ſent Me; and haſt loved Them, as thou haſt loved Me.

Third, *Jo.* x. 30. I and my Father are *one* [ἓν, one *thing*]. This means an Agreement in *Power*, *Will*, and *Conſent*. So *Rom.* xii. 5. We are *one* Body in Chriſt; and *Rom.* xvi. 6. that ye may with *one* Mind and *one* Mouth glorify God; and 1 *Cor.* iii. 6. 8. He that planteth and he that watereth are *one* (ἓν, one thing); i. e. in *Conſent*, *Teſtimony*, and *Will*. So ch. x. 17. *One* Body; and *Eph.* ii. 14. He is our peace, who hath made both (*i. e.* Jews and Gentiles) ἓν, *one thing*. And ἵνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον· *one* new Man. Verſe 15.

Now no thing can be more plain through the whole Goſpel, than the perfect Unity between God and Chriſt in carrying-on the ſame deſign in the ſame manner; in order to unite all good Men in the ſame Unity of deſign: that they may be partakers of the divine Nature, θείας κοινωνοὶ φυσέως. II *Pet.* i. 4. So that God and Chriſt are *one*, ἓν, one Thing; in the very ſame ſenſe in which Chriſt prays that his Diſciples may be ἓν, one Thing: which is not capable of being underſtood either of Subſtance or Perſon, and muſt be underſtood of Will, or Deſign, or Glory.

And therefore *Juſtin Martyr*, in his Dialogue with *Trypho*, ſays; the Perſon who appeared to *Abraham* and *Jacob* and *Moſes*, and is ſtiled *God*; is another Perſon diſtinct from

from the God who is the Maker of all things: diſtinct, I ſay, in *Number*; but not diſagreeing in *Will*: for I affirm, that he never did any thing; but what it was the Will of the Maker of the Univerſe (above whom there is no other God) that he ſhould do and ſay——And *Origen* ſays, the Father and Son are two in Subſtance; [τῇ ὑποστάσει] but in Concord, Agreement, and Sameneſs of Will, they are one. Contr. *Celſ.* 386. And again; If any one, ſays he, ſhould be afraid; leaſt we ſhould go over to the opinion of thoſe, who deny the Father and the Son to be *two* diſtinct Subſtances; [for that was *Heterodoxy* in his Days, which is looked upon to be *Orthodoxy* now:] let him conſider that text, "All that believed were of *one* "Heart and of *one* Soul:" and then he will perceive the meaning of this; "I and my Father are *one*."

In ſhort, the whole deſign and end of Chriſtianity is to complete the *Unity* between God and Man, that is here ſpoken of: that all Chriſtians may be *one* with Chriſt and God, even as *They* are *one*; that is, that they may learn to act upon the ſame Principles of Love, and Benevolence, and Equity; and purſue the Perfection and Happineſs of the Univerſe, and of every Individual, by the practice of Righteouſneſs: and ſo come to partake of the Divine Nature, and become Sons of God. For the Sum of all Perfection conſiſts in *Unity of Will and Deſign with God*, who is infinitely wiſe and juſt, and good. How the Unity of God was explained by the Antients, ſee in Dr. *Whitby*'s laſt Thoughts; p. 63 to 68.

End of the NOTES, &c. on the FIRST LETTER.

Prudence, by which I have been convinced, and the Reasons of so great a Change of my Sentiments: that if my present Opinions be agreeable to Truth, it may prevail with others, and if not, that I may at least appear to them not to have acted rashly or precipitately, and may give an opportunity to those who disapprove of my Conduct, to examine my Arguments, and either allow or disprove, or convince me of their weakness.

I know, that I have already forfeited the Esteem of many worthy and good Men, whose Friendship I have and know, and have enjoyed for a long time with much Pleasure and Advantage, who have never willfully done me wrong. As for the other Charges, which are made against me, I am well aware, that I shall not appear unjustly to the Disadvantage, which candid Persons, my Friends, who are thoroughly acquainted with my Principles, and the uprightness of my Intentions, deem my Truth and Love known me in Prosperity and Adversity, always the same, will continue to love me. Others, whatever you may think of his Opinions in Matters of Religion,

LETTER THE SECOND.

Then went up *Moſes* and *Aaron*, *Nadab* and *Abihu*, and Seventy of the Elders of *Iſrael*: And they ſaw the GOD of ISRAEL. *Ex.* xxiv. 9, 10.

No Man hath ſeen GOD at any time—Ye have neither heard his Voice at any time; nor ſeen his Shape; *John* i. 18—v. 37. I *Tim.* vi. 16.

Behold, I ſend an *Angel* before thee;—beware of him, and obey his Voice; provoke him not: for he will not pardon your Tranſgreſſions; for MY NAME is in him. *Ex.* xxiii. 20, 21.

I PROPOSE, in this *ſecond* Letter, to examine into the *Character* and *Perſon* of *Jeſus Chriſt*; that I may ſhew, whether He anſwers to the deſcription of the *Meſſiah* in *Our* Scriptures. And the firſt thing, that gives any light upon this Subject; is the frequent mention we find in the books of *Moſes*, of the appearances of JEHOVAH; and the many converſations, which we are told-of, between GOD and Man: That

Jehovah walked in the garden of *Eden* in the cool of the day, and paſſed judgment on *Adam* and *Eve* (*a*); and came down to ſee the Tower, which the children of men builded in the days of *Peleg* (*b*); and appeared to *Abraham* as a *Man* accompanied with two *Angels* in the Plains of *Mamre* (*c*); and ſpake to *Moſes* out of the Buſh (*d*); and went before the *Iſraelites* in a pillar of a Cloud by Day, and in a pillar of a Fire by Night (*e*); and was afflicted in all their afflictions (*f*); and appeared to *Moſes*, *Aaron*, *Nadab*, and *Abihu*, and the ſeventy Elders of *Iſrael* (*g*); and deſcended on Mount *Sinai*, to give the Law (*h*); and was heard by the Children of *Iſrael* to ſpeak with a great voice (*i*); and reſided in the Tabernacle (*k*); and promiſed that he would return again and reſide among Men in the latter day (*l*); and renewed that promiſe (*m*), in the days of *Darius Hyſtaſpis*; about 500 years before the Chriſtian Æra.

Many of theſe accounts are given in ſo plain and hiſtorical a manner, and with ſo many Circumſtances attending them; (which cannot be explained and accounted-for either by Viſion or figurative Expreſſion:) that both the Jews and

(*a*) *Gen.* iii. 8. &c. (*b*) xi. 5. (*c*) xviii. 1, 2. (*d*) *Ex.* iii. 2, 4. (*e*) xiii. 21. (*f*) *Iſ.* lxiii. 9. (*g*) *Ex.* xxiv. 10. (*h*) xix. (*i*) *Deut.* v. 22. (*k*) *Ex.* xxv. 22. (*l*) *Jer.* xxxi. 31. (*m*) *Zech.* ii. 10, 11.

Chriſ-

Chriſtians of former ages have looked upon them to be literal; and endeavoured to explain them accordingly(*n*).

That there are ſeveral things ſpoken-of, in the Scripture, concerning Almighty God, in a *figurative* way; as the *Arm* of God, the right *Hand* of God, &c. and others ſpoken-of, in *Viſion*; as where God is ſaid to be ſeen *ſitting* on his *Throne*, &c(*o*). is certain: but ſome of the Appearances I am ſpeaking-of are of a very different Nature from both theſe.

When *Jehovah* appeared to *Abraham* in the Plains of *Mamre*, with two *Angels*; they all appeared as *Men*, and it could not be in *Viſion*; becauſe *Sarah* alſo ſaw Him, and converſed with Him: and when God (or, as *Onkelos* reads it, the *Shechinah* of God (*p*);) appeared to *Moſes*, *Nadab*, *Aaron*, and *Abihu*; there is not the leaſt intimation of any *Viſion*; or room for any *Figure*: and the ſame is evident, in many other parts of the *Moſaïc* Hiſtory.

Theſe Actions therefore, which *Moſes* related as Hiſtorical Facts, muſt certainly be ſo; or elſe there is no dependence upon the literal ſenſe of any one action recorded in Scripture: and it becomes both Jews and Chriſtians to conſider,

(*n*) See the Quotation from *Theophilus*, Letter III.

(*o*) *Iſ.* iv. 1. *Teniſon*, on Idol. p. 337. (*p*) Non enim invenies Deum ullum opus feciſſe; niſi per manus alicujus Angeli. *More Nevoc.* p. 2. c. 6.

how ſuch actions can poſſibly be performed by *Jehovah*. For they are both agreed, that the Hiſtory is true; and yet that the Supreme Self-exiſtent God of the Univerſe hath never been *ſeen* or *heard* at any time.

"No man, ſays *Juſtin Martyr*, who has the "leaſt ſenſe, will dare to ſay; that the Maker "and Father of the Univerſe left the ſuperce-"leſtial Manſions, and appeared here in a little "part of the Earth." And *Maimonides* obſerves; that "it does no where appear, through the "whole of the Old Teſtament; that the Su-"preme God of the Univerſe hath performed any "work, but by the means of ſome *Angels* (*q*):" and *Vorſtius* ſays the ſame thing.

Dr. *Teniſon*, Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, ſays (*r*); that "as to the divine Subſtance of God, "who hath neither limits nor parts, nor phyſi-"cal motion, (which is diviſion of parts;) nor "figure, (which is inconſiſtent with immenſity;) "nor colour, (which is an effect of figure and "motion upon the brain:) it is certain, that in "*this* Body we *cannot ſee it*: and there is great "reaſon to doubt, whether we can do ſo in any "*other*; which, though it be celeſtial, yet is

(*q*) Sed nec liquido conſtat Deum hoc pacto (ſcil. immediato ſermone) ad ullum Mortalium, vel etiam *Moſem*, verba habuiſſe: imo non contemnendæ rationes contrariæ favent ſuſpicioni; *viz.* Deum cuncta potius Angeli famulitio ſub lege veteri adminiſtraſſe. *Maimon.* de fund. Leg. ch. ix. note 9. Edit. *Vorſtii*. (*r*) On Idol. p.312.

"but

" but Body:" and the Scripture account agrees with this Notion.

Accordingly, we find in *Deuteronomy*, that the argument againſt graven Images is founded upon this Obſervation; that our Fathers ſaw no manner of Similitude, in the day that the Lord ſpake in *Horeb* out of the Fire(*s*): ſo that God did not appear either by Perſon, or Symbol. And therefore Bp. *Bull*'s remark is true in fact, as well as in the opinion of the ancient learned Doctors among the Chriſtians; " that God the " Father hath *never been ſeen*, not even by aſſum- " ed appearance, or ſhape, or ſymbol; nor *can* " *be ſeen*(*t*):" and the Chriſtian Scriptures go ſtill farther; and declare, that no man hath *ſeen* God at any time; nor *can ſee* him: nor ever *heard his Voice*(*u*).

And

(*s*) Deut. iv. 12. (*t*) Ex primævorum Doctorum Sententia, Deus Pater a nemine unquam, ne per aſſumptas quidem ſpecies viſus eſt; aut videri poteſt. *Bulli* defenſ. ſect. iv. c. 3, 4. (*u*) *Jo.* i. 18—v. 37—1 *Tim.* i. 17. *Juſtin Martyr* ſays, a nemine viſus eſt, neque cum quopiam per ſeipſum collocutus eſt, quem Fabricatoram rerum cunctarum novimus. p. 248.

Limborch in his Reſp. ad 3 Script. Judæi, explains what is mean'd by *Moſes*' ſpeaking to God Face to Face—and after his proofs from Scripture he ſays; ex quibis liquet, totam Revelationem *Moſi* factam miniſterio Angeli qui perſonam Dei repræſentavit; ac proinde, perinde ac ſi Deus ipſe locutus eſt. p. 255. Edit. *Baſil.* See alſo *Orobio*'s quotation from *Tertullian*, p. 188. of which I ſhall quote a part.

And if this be the Caſe; as it is agreed by all men of Learning and Underſtanding, whether Jews or Chriſtians; that *Jehovah* ſo often appeared to our forefathers, and converſed with them; and yet that the Supreme *God* and Father of the Univerſe was *never ſeen* by any one, nor his *Voice heard*; there muſt be without doubt, ſome other perſon, beſides the *Supreme God* and Father of the Univerſe; *who is called by that Name.* And when we compare the ſeveral Texts of Scripture, wherein the *Jehovah* who appeared and converſed with Men, is called the *Angel* of *Jehovah*, as well as *Jehovah*; we can no longer doubt of it. For the *Angel* [or Meſſenger] of *Jehovah*, who is ſent; muſt be a different Being from the *Jehovah*, who ſent him. And the Reaſon he is called by the *ſame* Name, is thus well explained by R. *Joſue F. Sebib*, according to the common maxim not only in uſe among the Hebrews, but allowed-of by the general cuſtom of the World; *Loquitur Legatus ſermone mittentis eum*(*x*).

And

a part. Ecce autem *Moſes* alio loco refert, quod *Abrahæ* viſus ſit Deus: at idem *Moſes* dicit, quod nemo hominum vidit Deum & vivit. Si videri non poteſt Deus, quomodo viſus eſt Deus? aut ſi viſus eſt, quomodo videri non poteſt? ut *Joannes* & *Paulus*, quem nemo vidit. Ex quo intelligi poteſt, quod Pater viſus ſit qui nunquam viſus eſt; ſed Filius qui deſcendere ſolitus eſt & videri, quia deſcendit; eſt imago enim viſibilis Dei. *Lib. de Trin.* fol. 623.

(*x*) Uti bene obſervat R. *Joſ. F. Sebib* fol. 58. 4. ex *Deut.* xi. Col. 14. & *Gen.* xxxi. 13. ubi Angelus ſe vocat

Deum

And God himſelf hath given us the ſame ſolution of this difficulty; *Behold, I ſend an Angel, —to keep Thee in the way; and to bring Thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice; provoke him not, for he will not pardon your tranſgreſſions; for* MY NAME *is in him* (*y*): which not only means, that he ſpeaks in the Authority and Perſon of God; but that he is alſo called by the ſame *Name:* as will appear more plainly from the following Obſervations.

1. When *Hagar* fled from her Miſtreſs, an *Angel of God* found her: And *Moſes* mentions this Perſon ſoon after by the Name "*Jehovah*, that ſpake to her(*z*)."

2. The *Angel of Jehovah* appeared to *Moſes*, in a flame of fire in the Buſh (*a*); and *Moſes* ſaid, I will now turn aſide and ſee this great Sight; why the Buſh is not burned. And when *Jehovah* ſaw, that he turned aſide to ſee; Elohim called unto him out of the midſt of the Buſh;—moreover he ſaid I am the God of thy Father;—and—*Jehovah* God of your Fathers;—and the Chriſtians call him the Angel of the Lord(*b*). Here then the Angel of *Jehovah* is again called by the name *Jehovah*. The Angel in whom God put his name *Jehovah*, is fre-

Deum *Bethelis Maimon.* de Fund. Legis Leg. p. 101. Edit. *Vorſtii.* (*y*) *Ex.* xxiii. 20. (*z*) *Gen.* xvi. 7—13. (*a*) *Ex.* iii. 3, 4, 6, 15. (*b*) *Acts* vii. 30, 32, 35.

quently

quently called *Jehovah*; but the Supreme *Jehovah*, is never called the *Angel* of *Jehovah*, and therefore, where the ſame Perſon is called by both the Titles, it cannot mean any other than the Angel in whom God put his name.

3. It is ſaid; that *Jehovah* appeared to *Abraham*, in the Plains of *Mamre*(*c*); and He ſat in the Tent-door, in the heat of the day; and behold, three Men ſtood by him. Through this whole chapter *One* of theſe Men is called *Jehovah*. *Jehovah* ſaid, Wherefore did *Sarah* laugh? And *Jehovah* ſaid, ſhall I hide from *Abraham*, that thing which I do? And *Abraham* ſtood yet before *Jehovah*: And *Jehovah* went his way, as ſoon as he had left communing with *Abraham*. Whence it is plain, that *One* of thoſe who appeared as a Man, and is called *Jehovah*, and made the promiſe to *Sarah*, was not the inviſible God; but ſome other Being, called by his Name.

4. It is ſaid by *Jacob*(*d*), The Angel of God ſpake to me in a Dream; ſaying, *Jacob*; and I ſaid, Here am I: and he ſaid—I am the God of *Bethel*; where thou anointedſt the Pillar, and vowedſt a Vow unto Me(*e*).

Now the vow that *Jacob* made at Bethel was this—Then ſhall *Jehovah* be my God(*f*).

(*c*) *Gen.* xvii. 1, 2, 13, 17, 22, 23. (*d*) *Gen.* xxxi. 11, 13. (*e*) *Gen.* xxx. 13. (*f*) xxviii. 20, 21.

Whence

Whence it appears; that an *Angel* of God calls himſelf *Jehovah*, the God of *Bethel*.

5. It is ſaid; The *Angel* of God, which went before the Camp of *Iſrael*, removed and went behind them; and the Pillar of the Cloud went from before their Face, and ſtood behind them (*g*): and yet it is ſaid, in the chapter before; *Jehovah* went before them in a pillar of a Cloud to lead them the way, and by night in a pillar of Fire to give them Light. And it appears alſo that this Perſon is called *Jehovah* (*h*); and that he was worſhipped(*i*), and that he was the Angel of *Jehovah*, is confirmed from Ex. xxii, 34. where it is ſaid; "Behold, mine *Angel* ſhall go "before thee;" and by *Numb.* xx. 16. where it is ſaid; that *Jehovah* ſent an *Angel*, and hath brought us forth out of *Egypt*.

6. *Jehovah*, who gave the Law, ſaid unto *Moſes*; Come up Thou and *Aaron*, *Nadab*, and *Abihu*, and ſeventy of the Elders of *Iſrael*—and they went up, and ſaw the *God* of *Iſrael*(*k*), Now it is plain, this could not be the Inviſible *Jehovah*; becauſe he was ſeen by all theſe people. And his appearances in *Shechinah*, and in a Cloud(*l*) confirm, that he was the *Same Angel* who is called *Jehovah*(*m*), and the *Angel of God* (*n*); who went before the Camp of *Iſrael* in a

(*g*) *Ex.* xiv. 19—xiii. 21. (*h*) *Ex.* xiv. 24. Numb. xii. 5. (*i*) *Ex.* xxxiii. 10. (*k*) *Ex.* xxiv. 1, 9, 10. (*l*) ver. 16, 17. (*m*) *Ex.* xiii. 21. (*n*) *Ex.* xvi. 29.

pillar of Fire and a Cloud. For *this* is the Glory by which this *Angel* uſed to be known and diſtinguiſhed; and in which he appeared in the Sanctuary, and in the Viſion to *Iſaiah* in the Temple(*o*). And in this interpretation the Chriſtian Scriptures intirely agree with Ours. For though it is ſaid, *Jehovah* deſcended upon the Mount; and ſaid, I am *Jehovah*; and ſpake all the words of the Law: yet the Chriſtians tell us; that it was "an *Angel*, that ſpake to *Moſes* in the Mount *Sinai*, and with our Fathers who received the lively Oracles to give unto Us:" and that the Law was given by the diſpoſition of *Angels*; and that it was ordained by *Angels*, in the hands of a Mediator: and they call the Law, the Word ſpoken by *Angels*(*p*). And though it be ſaid, *Jehovah* called unto *Moſes* out of the Mountain, *Ex.* xix. 3. yet the Chriſtians interpret this by telling us(*q*), that God ſent him by the hands of the *Angel* which appeared to him in the Buſh.

7. The ſame who contended with *Jacob*(*r*), and is called *God* by Him, is declared by *Hoſea* to be an *Angel*, xii. 4. and in the next verſe he is called the *Jehovah* of Hoſts; and his name or memorial is *Jehovah*, as was the name or memo-

(*o*) Deut. v. 24. Ex. xvi. 7, 10. xxiv. 16. Lev. ix. 6, 23. Numb. xiv. 10. xvi. 19, 42. xx. 6. Iſ. vi. 1, 2. (*p*) Acts vii. 38, 53. Gal. iii. 9. Heb. iii. 2. (*q*) Acts vii. 35. (*r*) Gen. xxxii. 24.

rial of the *Angel* that appeared in the flaming Buſh(*s*).

8. But this will appear more remarkably evident, from *Ex.* xxxiii. where the name of *Jehovah* is in the moſt ſolemn manner conferred upon the Angel, who led the *Iſralites* through the Wilderneſs.

The Hiſtory is as follows(*t*). God, in his anger againſt the people of *Iſrael* for making the golden Calf; threatens, by the *Angel* who led them as a pillar of Fire, that he would deliver them into the hands of ſome *other Angel:* and this Threat was known to all the people. "But "this ſecond Angel was not the *Angel of the Co-* "*venant*; [as R. *Menahem* obſerves;] of whom "he ſpake, in times of favourable acceptance, "*My Preſence* ſhall go; but an other Perſon." —*Moſes* therefore complains; that *Jehovah* had ſaid unto him, Bring up my people; but had not let him know, *Whom* he would ſend before them: and he prays, that (as he had found favor in his ſight) he would lead them *Himſelf*(*u*). *Jehovah* complies with his requeſt; and declares, that his *Preſence*(*x*); that is, the *Angel* ſo called, ſhould

(*s*) Ex iii. 4, 6, 7. (*t*) *Ex.* xxxiii. 1—19.

(*u*) *Himſelf*] It is in the *Hebrew*, ſhew me thy Way. See the Biſhop of *Clogher* on Spirit, p 68. But the LXX read, manifeſt thyſelf: ἐμφάνισον σεαυτὸν, ſhew thyſelf to be our Conductor. See *Pſ.* lxvii. 2. lxxvii. 13.

(*x*) *Preſence*]. The LXX read myſelf, αὐτὸς, will go before Thee; and ſo the Phraſe is uſed, II *Sam.* xvii. 14.

ſhould go before them. *Moſes* then prays, that *Jehovah* would aſſure him, that it was *He* who would go before them; [and not any inferior Angel, as he had threaten'd;] by ſhewing him his *Glory*(*y*). This alſo *Jehovah* complies with; declaring, I will make ALL my Goodneſs(*z*) or *Glory* to paſs before Thee: and I will proclaim the name of *Jehovah* before thee: But as to the ſight of his *Face*, i. e. the full Sight of him in all his Glory; as he was about to appear, in order to give the fulleſt Satisfaction that it was no *Inferior Angel*(*a*); *Moſes* was not capable to ſupport

That thy Face or Preſence go to the battle: i. e. Thou, in thy own perſon. And the *Hebrews* expound it to mean the Angel, the Redeemer, mentioned, *Iſ.* lxviii. 9. and the Angel of the Covenant, *Mal.* iii. 1. R. *Menahem* ad loc. *Ainſworth.*

(*y*) *Glory*] i. e. the *Shechinah*; or, as the LXX tranſlate it, δόξα Θεῦ· the viſible ſign of God's preſence, when he went before them as a Pillar of Fire; in which manner he afterwards appeared in the Sanctuary, and in the Temple. See the Texts quoted in p. 5. And in this ſenſe the *Chaldee* underſtanding it adds; verſe 16. if the *Shechinah* go not with us, that miraculous works may be done for us.

(*z*) *Goodneſs*, i. e. *Glory*, which he deſired to ſee, ver. 18. and which did paſs before him; ver. 22. The *Chaldee* calls it my *Glory*, and the LXX τῇ δόξῃ.

(*a*) Angel] Abp. *Teniſon* ſays; whilſt *Moſes* is not content with the promiſe of an aſſiſtant Angel, but expreſly petitioneth for the continuance of *God's preſence*; (compare *Ex.* xxxiii. 2, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. with xxiii. 21, 22, 23.) he leaveth us not in want of a Commentator

to

port it(*b*): and therefore he ſhould only have an imperfect view and glimpſe of him; as when we ſee a perſon who has juſt paſſed and turned his back upon us; or as his Glory was ſeen in the Cloud: and leaſt the ſight ſhould have too fatal an effect upon him, he ſhould be placed in the Cleft of a Rock; as *Elijah* ſtood in the Entrance of a Cave(*c*), in a dark and confined place; where the full Refulgence of the *Shechinah* [the proper Glory of the only begotten of the Father] (*d*), ſhould not hurt him. But at the ſame time, he would aſſure him; that it was the *Angel of the Face* or *Preſence* of God, who uſed to appear under the Name and Perſon of *Jehovah* by proclaiming his Name before him, as he paſſed by: "I will proclaim the Name of *Je-*"*hovah* before Thee." And this was to be the proof to *Moſes* and to all the people, which he had deſired; that the *Angel*, who uſed to go before them in the *Shechinah*, had not left them; and an Encouragement to them to march forward. Accordingly the Lord *Jehovah* deſcend-

to tell us what kind of Angel was preſent with him. That Angel no doubt it was, who is called by that name in the *Hebrew* of *Eccleſ.* vi. 5. but by the LXX Interpreters the Face of God. On *Idol.* 331. See Letter III. note I.

(*b*) Abp. *Tenniſon* obſerves; neither *Moſes* nor any man living being able to behold the face or full luſtre of it (the *Shechinah*); if it had been granted, he muſt have paid down his Life for the price of his Curioſity. On *Idol.* 336.

(*c*) I Kings, xix. 11, 13. (*d*) Jo. i. 14.

ed

ed in the Cloud, and ſtood with *Moſes*, and proclaimed the Name of *Jehovah*, and paſſed before him and proclaimed *Jehovah*; *Jehovah*, merciful and gracious, long ſuffering and abounding in Goodneſs and Truth, keeping Mercy for thouſands, forgiving iniquity and tranſgreſſion and ſin, that will by no means clear the guilty; [This is the ſame character which was given of the *Jehovah* Angel(*e*),] viſiting the iniquity of the Fathers upon the Children, and upon the Children's Children, unto the third and fourth generation(*f*). Here we find, that the name of *Jehovah* is in the moſt ſolemn manner conferred on the *Angel*, who led the Iſraelites in the Wilderneſs; and he is deſcribed perſonally, as their Lord and Governor.

I have not ſcrupled here to underſtand the Text, "Thou canſt not ſee my *Face*; for there ſhall no man ſee Me and live:" to relate merely to the *Angel* of God's Face or Preſence appearing in ALL his Goodneſs or Glory; for the following Reaſons. 1ſt. It was not *God* himſelf, but an *Angel:* and the ſeeing God, is not here ſpoken of as a thing *impoſſible*, upon account of his Inviſibility; but only as a thing of *fatal Conſequence*; for the Impoſſibility is not once hinted, but the Sight of him actually ſuppoſed; or elſe the effect of it could not have been mentioned.

(*e*) Ex. xxiii. 21. (*f*) Ex. xxxiv. 5, 6, 7.

And

And it was the general Opinion among our Fathers; that Death was the Conſequence of ſeeing the Face of an *Angel:* ſuch was the apprehenſion of *Jacob*, when he ſaw the Face of God (*g*), who is declared to be an *Angel* by *Hoſea*; I have ſeen *God*, Face to Face; ſays he, and my Life is preſerved. And ſo again, when *Moſes*, *Nadàb*, *Aaron*, and *Abihu*, and the ſeventy Elders ſaw the ſame perſon; called there *Jehovah* the God of *Iſrael*; it is ſaid, they ſaw God; and did eat and drink(*h*); i. e. they continued *alive:* and ſo alſo *Gideon* and *Manoah* were both afraid of *Death*; becauſe they had ſeen the Face of *God*; or, of an *Angel*(*i*). And upon occaſion of this fear it was, that the people ſaid unto *Moſes:* ſpeak Thou with us, and we will hear; but let not *God* ſpeak with us, leaſt we die(*k*). And though they ſaw, that *God* did talk with Man, and He *lived*; yet they ſtill feared, and ſaid unto *Moſes*; Now therefore why ſhould we *die?* for this great fire will conſume us; if we hear the Voice of *Jehovah* our God any more, then ſhall we *die*. For who is there of all Fleſh; that hath heard the Voice of the Living God, ſpeaking out of the midſt of the Fire as we have; and *lived*(*l*)? Here we find; that, wherever they met

(*g*) Hoſea xii. 4. Gen. xxxii. 30. (*h*) Ex. xxiv. 10, 11. (*i*) Jud. vi. 22. 23. Jud. xiii. 22. Iſ. vi. 5. (*k*) Ex. xx. 19. (*l*) Deut. v. 24, 25, 26.

with

with this notion, they were as much afraid of *hearing* the *Voice* of an *Angel*; as of *ſeeing* him: for his great Voice was heard out of the midſt of it, [the Mount] with thunderings and lightnings, and the voice of the Trumpet exceeding loud; ſo that all the Camp trembled. Now the Perſon, who appeared and ſpake to them with all this Terror, was the *Jehovah Angel*(*m*), and therefore the Expreſſion, No man ſhall ſee my Face, and *live*; ſeems properly to relate to the appearance of this *Angel*, accompanied with the Symbols of Terror and deſtructive Power: for, as to the *Supreme God* himſelf, *He* was never *Seen*: nor *His* Voice *heard*(*n*).

2. A ſecond Reaſon why I ſo underſtand it, is; becauſe *Death* was *not* the conſequence of ſeeing *this Angel*, when he appeared like a *Man*; as he did to *Abraham*, at the deſtruction of *Sodom* (*o*); and to *Jacob*, when he gave him the name of *Iſrael*(*p*); nor even when he appeared in the *Shechinah*, while this appearance was at a diſtance as devouring Fire upon the top of the Mount(*q*); or was tempered with Clouds and thick Darkneſs. And therefore the only ſenſe, in which it appears capable of being mean'd, *that no man can ſee the Face of God and live*; ſeems to be in the particular Circumſtances of the preſent Caſe, or

(*m*) Acts vii. 30. (*n*) Jo. i. 18. v. 37. I Tim. vii. 16. (*o*) *Gen.* xviii. (*p*) *Gen.* xxxii. (*q*) *Ex.* xxiv. 17. *Deut.* iv. 11.

a ſimilar

a ſimilar one; when this Angel was to appear in ALL his Glory or Goodneſs(*r*). For this Reaſon *Moſes* was not able to enter into the Tent of the Congregation; becauſe the Cloud abode thereon, and the Glory of the Lord filled the Tabernacle(*s*). Nor could the Prieſts ſtand to miniſter; nor enter into the houſe of the Lord(*t*): and for the ſame Reaſon it ſeems that *Jehovah* ſaid unto *Moſes*; "Speak unto *Aaron* thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place within the Veil, before the Mercy-ſeat that is upon the Ark; that he die *not*: for I will appear in the Cloud upon the Mercy-ſeat(*u*). Whereas, when he did not appear in the Cloud and thick Darkneſs, the Glory was too powerful for mortal Sight. And, if we look into the Chriſtian Scriptures, this Reaſon will be confirmed; for the Divine Light or Glory, in which it is ſaid that Chriſt will appear hereafter in flaming fire taking Vengeance(*x*), [and in reference to which he is called ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης, the Effulgence of God's Glory(*y*)], is ſaid to be the Deſtruction of wicked Men, whom he will deſtroy with the brightneſs [ἐπιφάνια] of his coming; who ſhall be puniſhed with everlaſting deſtruction from the preſence of God, and from the Glory of his Power. The words are very

(*r*) *Ex.* xxxiii. 19. (*s*) *Ex.* xl. 25. (*t*) I *Kings* viii. 10, 11. II *Chron.* vii. 2, 3.—1, 14. (*u*) *Lev.* xvi. 2. (*x*) II *Theſſ.* i. 8, 9—ii. 8. (*y*) *Heb.* i. 3.

remarkable; the Preſence of God being the name of the Angel called, προσώπος τῦ Θεῦ· and the Glory of his Power may mean, by a ἰσχὺς δυνάμεως, his powerful glory, in which he appeared as *devouring Fire*.

Before I go any farther, it may be proper to conſider the meaning of this *Angel*'s Title; The *Face* or *Preſence* of *God*. The expreſſion is a *Hebraiſm*, and ſignifies God himſelf; as it is frequently underſtood(z), and ſo, the *Face* of thy Brother ſignifies thy Brother himſelf; and the *face* of the Country, the *face* of the Deep, the *face* of the Earth, of the Field, of the Gate, of the Waters, of the Wilderneſs, of the World, ſignify in the Old Teſtament the things themſelves: and ſo the *Face* of *Jehovah* ſignifies *Jehovah* himſelf; and for the ſame Reaſon the Angel of *Jehovah* being called by the name *Jehovah*, is ſometimes called the Angel of his *Face* or *Preſence*; and ſometimes the *Face* or *Preſence* of *Jehovah*: becauſe, as I obſerved, he ſupported the Perſon, Character and Authority of the *inviſible Jehovah*; and was called by his Name. *Ex.* xxxiv. 6(a),

We

(z) *Gen.* xix. 13. I *Sam.* xxvi. 20. I *Kings* xiii 6. *Pſ.* xxxiv. 16, &c. (a) The Chriſtians have given us a very good account and Explanation, in what manner the Supreme *Jehovah* is repreſented by the Angel of his Preſence; in what they have ſaid of Chriſt: See *Poole's Synopſis* on *Jo.* i. 18. ἐκεῖνον ἐξηγήσατο· which they explain *enarravit expoſuit*;

We ſee then, according to the Old Teſtament, that the ſacred Writers attribute to the *Angel*, who acts in the name and authority and moral Character of God, the name *Jehovah*: and there could be no miſtake in this particular among our forefathers, as if this *Angel* was the *ſupreme* God, becauſe we find by the Hiſtory, that he never acted in his own Name; or by his own Authority: but merely as the *Angel* of God. And as *Moſes* knew the perſon, who ſpake in the name of God and called himſelf *I am*(*b*), to be an *Angel*; and declares him to be ſo, when he ſpeaks of his appearance to the Patriarchs; it is certain the Patriarchs themſelves, to whom the Revelations were made, and from whom as 'tis probable *Moſes* received thoſe Accounts by Tradition, or *Cabbala*; could not be ignorant of it. And we ſee that they *were not*, by the Prayer of *Jacob*; in which he conſiders the perſon, who had ſo often appeared to him; the *Elohim*, before whom his Fathers, *Abraham* and *Iſaac* did walk; the *Elohim*, which fed him all his Life to that day; to be the *Angel* that redeemed him from all Evil(*c*): and conſequently

expoſuit; non tum ſermone et prædicatione, quam expreſſione et repræſentatione; quippe Patris Character; as ſays *De Dieu* from *Heinſius*: and again; ἐξηγήσατο· *idem Helleniſtis quod* ἐφανέρωσε, *repreſentavit, manifeſtum generi humano fecit.*

(*b*) *Ex.* iii. 2, 14. *Acts* vii. 38, 53. *Gal.* iii. 19. *Heb.* ii. 3. *Ex.* xix. 3. interpreted *Acts* vii. 35. (*c*) *Gen.* xlviii. 15, 16.

not the Supreme *Jehovah*, but the *Redeeming Angel*.

And accordingly we find; that this Angel, ſpeaking in the *name* of *God*, that ſent him, uſes the *Firſt* perſon: (as an Ambaſſador does, in the name of his King; or the *Roman Fecialis* did, in the name of the Roman People)(*d*): and *that*, even when he ſpeaks concerning himſelf, whom He then mentions in the *third* perſon; "Behold, ſays he, I ſend an Angel before Thee;—beware of *him*, and obey *his* voice." Theſe are the words of the *Jehovah Angel*, ſpeaking in the *firſt* Perſon in the name of God, and ſpeaking of himſelf in the *third* Perſon: and ſo he ſpeaks of himſelf to *Nicodemus*. *Jo.* iii.—"And no man hath aſcended up to Heaven; but he that came down from Heaven, even the ſon of Man that is in Heaven—And as *Moſes* lifted up the ſerpent in the Wilderneſs, even ſo ſhall the ſon of Man be lifted up—That whoſoever believeth in him ſhould not periſh, but have eternal life"—And ſo the Speech goes-on to the end of the 18th verſe. "For God ſo loved the World,

(*d*) When the *Roman Fecialis* declared war in the name of the Senate, he ſpake in the firſt perſon; *Roſin. Rom. Antiq.* Lib. x. ch. 1. and in making leagues ſpake in the ſame Stile: If I keep my Faith, &c. but if I violate it, then may I periſh; meaning the ſenate and people of *Rome*. See *Kennet*'s Antiq. part 2, ch. 17—Even an *inferior Angel* is introduced thus ſpeaking in the firſt perſon; *Rev.* xi. 1. ---3. And I will give power to my two witneſſes, &c. and thus the Angel *Jehovah* ſpeaks, *Judg.* ii. 1.

that

that he gave his only begotten Son; that whoſoever believeth on him, ſhould not periſh; but have everlaſting life. For God ſent not his Son into the World, to condemn the World; but that the World through him might be ſaved. He that believeth on him, is not condemned; but he that believeth not, is condemned already; becauſe he hath not believed in the Name of the only begotten Son of God." *Jo.* iii. 14. to 19. And thus he ſpeaks of himſelf, *Luke* xviii. 8. "Nevertheleſs, when the Son of Man cometh, ſhall he find Faith on the Earth?" And ſo God ſpeaks of himſelf in the third Perſon, *Pſ.* l. 22, 23. and elſewhere: "Now conſider this, ye that forget God; leaſt I tear you in pieces, and there be none to deliver. Whoſo offereth praiſe, glorifieth me; and to him that ordereth his Converſation aright will I ſhew the Salvation of *God*.

Again; whatever is *performed* by this *Angel*, is ſaid to be performed by *God himſelf*. Thus *Ex.* iii. 14. "*Jehovah* ſaid unto *Moſes*, I am that I am; Thus ſhalt thou ſay unto the Children of *Iſrael*, *I am* hath ſent me unto you:" and yet the Chriſtians agree with Us, that this Perſon was not the Supreme Inviſible *Jehovah*; but his *Angel*. *Acts* vii. 35.

Theſe two ways of ſpeaking are agreeable to the common received Cuſtoms continually in uſe among Mankind; and well underſtood. As I

have

have expreſſed the firſt in the Words of R. *Joſ. F. Sehib*, *Loquitur legatus ſermone mittentis eum*; So the latter may be expreſſed as conciſely, by this common Maxim; *Qui facit per* alium, *facit per ſe*. And this manner of ſpeaking is no leſs frequent in the New Teſtament than in the Old. The Salvation vouchſafed to Mankind is there called the *Salvation* both of *God* and *Chriſt*. It is *Chriſt* who raiſeth us from the dead; and *God* who giveth us the Victory over Death through him. *God* is called our Creator, though he created all things *by Chriſt*(e): and the *Kingdom* of Heaven is called the Kingdom both of *God* and of *Chriſt*. *Chriſt* is ſaid in one place to *forgive* us; and in another place, *God* is ſaid to forgive us for *Chriſt's ſake*; or, by Chriſt; [διὰ Χριστοῦ.] So that the two Revelations ſpeak the ſame language; and conſider God and his Miniſter as one and the ſame [ἓν,] in *Deſign*, and *Will*, and *Execution*.

Having now proved, that the *Angel* of *God* is in many places of Scripture called by the name *Jehovah*; and that we are expreſsly told, that God *put his name* in him; we need be in no doubt, that it was this *viſible Jehovah*, and not the *inviſible* one; that appeared and ſpake to the Patriarchs. But becauſe ſome eminent Chriſtian Writers, who allow the Truth of this, have yet

(e) *Col.* i. 16.

involved

involved their Readers in thick darkneſs; by aſſerting, that the Angel of *Jehovah*, who appeared to the *Patriarchs*, was *God himſelf*; or *Jehovah himſelf:* it will be neceſſary here to take notice of this Expreſſion; and ſhew the impropriety of it. Dr. *Allix* ſays; it was the ſame Son, who appeared often under the Character of the Angel of the Lord; though he was not a creäted Angel, but *Jehovah himſelf*(*f*); and that the old Synagogue expected, that he ſhould be *Jehovah indeed*(*g*); and that God *himſelf* appeared(*h*); and this Angel was God *himſelf*(*i*). And Bp. *Pearſon* ſays of the Chaldee Paraphraſts; that they often uſe the *Word* of God, for God *himſelf:* and that eſpecially, with relation to the Creäation of the World(*k*); p. 118. and quotes ſeveral Texts to that purpoſe: but they may all be anſwered by this one argument; that God creäted the World by the *Logos*. And Bp. *Bull* calls him *Ipſe Deus*. Other Writers ſpeak in the ſame manner; as if they thought it neceſſary to confound the *Perſons*, in order to preſerve the *Unity*. For who can imagine the Words *God himſelf*, *Jehovah himſelf*, to mean any thing elſe than one and the ſame *eſſential* and *numerical Perſon?*

(*f*) *Allix* on the Jewiſh Ch. 141. (*g*) *Ib.* 7, 286, &c. (*h*) *Ib.* 2, 10. (*i*) 208. (*k*) *Pearſon*, ibid. p. 70. note (*a*).

Let

Let us conſider it in this ſenſe; and, if it be the true one, then, wherever *Chriſt* is ſpoken of, we may ſubſtitute the words *God himſelf*; for ſo it muſt be underſtood: and *vice verſâ*; and ſee what Confuſion this will make.—When *Chriſt* ſays, I have told you the truth which I have heard from *God* (*l*); it muſt mean, I have told you the truth which I have heard from *Myſelf*. When he ſays, I am one that bear witneſs of myſelf; and the Father that ſent me beareth witneſs of me (*m*); how can this be the Teſtimony of *Two*, if Chriſt be God *himſelf?* Beſides this he muſt ſend *himſelf*. He muſt go away to him that ſent him; i. e. to *himſelf* (*n*). He muſt give a Revelation to *himſelf*, intercede with *himſelf*, and pray to *himſelf* not to forſake *himſelf*, and, what is abſolutely inconſiſtent with the Mediatorial Scheme and a contradiction in Terms, he muſt be the Mediator between *himſelf* and Man (*o*).

But though theſe learned men, by talking in this unguarded manner, muſt unavoidably bring the greateſt confuſion into the minds of the Vulgar; it muſt be confeſſed, they do not appear at other times to have any ſuch meaning; as their words above quoted do naturally imply:

(*l*) *John* viii. 26. (*m*) *Ib.* 17, 18. (*n*) *Ib.* 5.
(*o*) See *Whitby*'s laſt Thoughts, p. 54. and Unit. Tracts, vol. 4. Tr. 7th. A Humble Inquiry, pa. 7.

but

but on the contrary agree, that the Father and Son are *different* and *diſtinct Beings*.

Dr. *Allix*, in quoting *Zech.* ii. 11. *And thou ſhalt know that the Lord of Hoſts hath ſent me unto Thee*, obſerves; that here are two *Jehovahs*; one who ſends, and another who is ſent(*p*): and that the *Word* is clearly diſtinguiſhed from *God* who ſends him(*q*).—And ſpeaking of *Jehovah* raining fire from *Jehovah* out of Heaven, he ſays; there is *Jehovah* and *Jehovah*: and, if theſe do not make *two*, I know not what will expreſs a Plurality(*r*). And Biſhop *Bull*, though he calls Chriſt *God himſelf*, in the ninth page of his book; yet he lets us know, in the tenth; that he does *not* mean, that Chriſt is *God himſelf*; but the *Son* of God: for in a Note on *Exod.* xxiii. 20. he ſays; "*God*, that is, the *Son of God*, as all pri-" mitive Antiquity underſtood it; ſpeaking to " *Moſes*, promiſed to ſend an Angel before his " people(*s*)." And he proves this to be the ſenſe of the Chaldee-Paraphraſes, from their interpretation of *Gen.* xx. 3. And the *Word* of God came from the face of God to *Abimelech*(*t*): which certainly, he ſays, could not be underſtood, and God *himſelf* came from the face of

(*p*) P. 250. (*q*) 263. (*r*) P. 120. (*s*) Deus, hoc eſt, Filius Dei, ut ſenſit omnis Antiquitas primæva; Moſi locutus promittit ſe Angelum præmiſſurum populo ſuo. (*t*) Et venit Verbum Dei a facie Dei ad *Abimelech*: quod certe non poteſt intelligi, et venit Ipſe Deus a facie Dei. *Bulli* Op. p. 14.

God. And on *Pſ.* cx. 1. Sit thou on my right hand, he ſays; this can by no means be underſtood, the Lord ſaid to *himſelf*; Sit thou on my right hand(*u*). Thus we ſee theſe great men have a *ſecret* meaning to their Words, different from what appears to the Eyes of a common Reader; who can underſtand them in no other ſenſe than what will render his Faith a Syſtem of Confuſion.

'Tis true, we may ſay; that One of theſe *Jehovahs* is the *Jehovah himſelf* who ſent, and the other the *Jehovah himſelf* who was ſent by him. But we muſt not ſay in an abſolute manner, without ſuch diſtinction: that each of theſe is *Jehovah himſelf:* for then what becomes of the Plurality of *Perſons?*

The only apparent Reaſon for this confuſed way of ſpeaking is this; that though they ſuppoſe the *Perſons* of the Father and Son to be different, yet they believe their *Eſſence* to be the ſame: and from thence they draw this Concluſion, that the *Word* of God is God *himſelf.* But the Conſequence does by no means follow; not even from the *Identity of Eſſence:* for the Expreſſion *Himſelf* is always underſtood to include *Perſonal,* as well as *Eſſential* Identity: and conſequently, if the *Son* of God be God *himſelf,* he

(*u*) Sede a Dextris meis: nullo modo poteſt id intelligi divit Dominus *ſibimet ipſi,* Sede, &c.

muſt

muſt not only be the ſame *Eſſence*, but the ſame *Perſon*.—And this muſt alſo be the Conſequence; if it is aſſerted that *Chriſt* is God *himſelf*, as to his *Eſſence*; for how can this be true; if Chriſt be *ſent* from the Father, and actually *deſcended* from Heaven? Did the Father ſend his own Subſtance? that is impoſſible. Or did the Son deſcend without his Subſtance? that is in like manner impoſſible; an unſubſtantial Being could not be capable of a Miſſion; and to ſuppoſe but one identical Subſtance to the Father and Son, is the very Doctrine that was condemned by *Athanaſius* as *Sabellian*(*x*). It is to ſuppoſe them to be μονούσιοι & ταυτούσιοι, ἓν τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ, & ὑπόστασις τριπρόσωπος· by all which the Hereſy of *Sabellius* is deſcribed(*y*).

But, what is much more to the purpoſe; this Language is directly contrary to the Scripture; where we find, that *Chriſt* is not God *himſelf*: for *Jeſus Chriſt* expreſsly ſpeaks of God, as a *diſtinct* Being; and ſays, "He ſhall know my "Doctrine; whether I ſpeak of *God*, or whether "I ſpeak of *myſelf*(*z*)." Now if *Chriſt* be God *himſelf*, then his words muſt be thus interpreted; He ſhall know, whether I ſpeak of *God himſelf*;

(*x*) See Letter I. Note viii. Dr. Waterland's opinion confirms this, p. 32. (*y*) They do ἀναιρεῖν καὶ ἀθετεῖν τὴν ὕπαξιν τοῦ υἱοῦ· take away and deſtroy the Exiſtence of the Son. (*z*) *Jo.* xii. 17.

or whether I ſpeak of *God himſelf:* which it is abſurd to ſuppoſe. And here it is obſervable; that he does not diſtinguiſh himſelf from God, as being *God the Father*; but as being *God*(*a*).

Dr. *Allix* ſeems ſenſible of this: and after concluding one while that the *Logos* is God *himſelf*, and at another time that he is the *Angel* of God; and nevertheleſs *God*, becauſe an *uncrëated* Angel: and that it was not the *Father* who appeared to the Patriarchs, but *Chriſt*; He concludes thus: "It remains therefore certain; "that the *Word*, mentioned by *Philo* and the "paraphraſes, is not an *Angel*; but a *divine Per-* "*ſon*, θεὸς, as *Philo* calls him many times; and, "if the expreſſion be allowed of, δεύτερος θεὸς, as "he ſpeaks; whoſe proper name is *Elohim*(*b*):" and he ſays, the Jews looked upon the *Logos* as a *divine* Perſon(*c*). And again, I ſpeak of the appearance of an Angel; who is called *God*, and worſhiped as *God*, under the Old Teſtament. And Biſhop *Bull* ſpeaks in the ſame way; and ſays, "Thoſe who would explain *Mimara* (the Word,) in the *Chaldee* Paraphraſes to mean αὐτὸς, God *himſelf*; are miſtaken. For that the ancient *Hebrews* believed the Word of God to be a diſtinct Subſtance from God the Father, [λόγον quendam Dei Patris, revera diſtinctam ab ipſo patre Hypoſtaſin] who uſed to deſcend and con-

(*a*) *Emlyn's* Trac. (*b*) *Allix* on the Jew. Ch. 199, 438, 439. (*c*) *Ibid.* 200.

verſe

verſe with men. So that at laſt we are let into their meaning; and find, when they chooſe to be underſtood, they ſpeak the ſame language with the ancient Fathers; (before the change of the Faith which was made at the Council of *Nice*) who believed that Chriſt was *God*, or a *divine* Perſon; yet not the *Supreme* God, or God *himſelf*; but his *Son*; to whom the Divinity was communicated by the Father (τῇ μεθοχῇ τῆς Θεότητος, by Communication of Divinity or Godhead, as *Origen* expreſſes it(*d*), and upon this account, Some of the Fathers ventured to call him δεύτερον Θεὸν· a ſecond God, and *Juſtin Martyr* ſays, he is ἕτερος τῷ παῖρὸς ἀριθμῷ, ὲ γνώμῃ(*e*): different from the Father in Number, not in Will and Deſign. And they worſhiped him, not becauſe they believed him to be God *himſelf*; but becauſe God had commanded it.—And they did not deny him to be an *Angel*, becauſe he is ſo called both in the Old and New Teſtament(*f*); whereas God *himſelf* is never called ſo.

It may be proper here to take notice of an argument which is uſed by Mr. *Lowman* againſt the Exiſtence of the viſible *Jehovah:* viz. that the imaginary appearance of a ſecond *Jehovah* is nothing more than the appearance of the inviſible *Jehovah* himſelf by *Symbol:* and that in the ſame ſenſe plagues and earthquakes and other

(*d*) *Origen.* Com. on Jo. p. 46—8. (*e*) *Tryph.* 276.
(*f*) *Deut.* v. 24. *Acts* vii. 35.

viſi-

viſitations of God are called the Angels of God.—Now I am not able to conceive how an Angel called *Jehovah* who actually appears and converſes, can be conſidered merely as a Symbol; as when *Jehovah* appeared in the Plains of *Mamre* and at other times. A Plague or an Earthquake may be called an Angel of *Jehovah*, *i. e.* a Meſſenger of *Jehovah*, though it be no *Perſon:* but it is never called *Jehovah*. And when a real *Perſon* appears and ſpeaks and is called *Jehovah*; it is a very different thing from calling a Plague or an Earthquake *the Meſſenger* of *Jehovah*.—I took no particular notice of this Objection upon publiſhing this letter, becauſe I thought I had ſaid enough to obviate it. But as it has been repeated by a very learned and reſpectable writer, I ſhall confirm what I have ſaid upon the ſubject, by obſerving that it muſt appear even from the contexts prefixed to this letter; that a Perſon called *Jehovah* appeared to the Patriarchs, and was therefore viſible—that he appeared to ſeveral Perſons at the ſame time, and therefore his appearance was not in viſion—and that he converſed with them Perſonally; and therefore was not a Symbol, but a real Perſon.

I ſhall now go on to ſhew; that both the *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian* Revelations, and all the affairs of Mankind relative to their Salvation, are carried-on by one and the ſame Perſon; who appeared

peared to our forefathers, and converſed with them; to wit, the *Logos*, or *Word* of God; as he is called by *Philo*, and the Apoſtles of *Chriſt*; to whom *Clem. Alex.* aſcribeth the Myſteries of the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, as to the great Teacher of them before his Incarnation. So that he, as a divine Subſtitute of the Father, gave the Law of Reaſon to *Adam*; the *Jewiſh* Law to *that people*; and to *all the World* the *Chriſtian* Law or Will of God(*g*).

And this Queſtion I ſhall conſider and examine;

I. By the reaſon and conſiſtency of the Thing.
II. By the words of Scripture.
III. By the interpretation of Scripture given us by the Jews and Chriſtians; which laſt head I ſhall leave to the next Letter.

I. I ſhall conſider the reaſon and conſiſtency of the Thing.

Dr. *Whichcote* has obſerved, in one of his Aphoriſms; what appears agreeable to the general opinion both of the Ancients and Moderns, and no leſs ſo to the divine Wiſdom and Goodneſs; viz. That "as there are no effects in the "Courſe of *Nature*, but what God hath *ſecured* "by vigorous and effectual Cauſes; ſo he hath "not taken leſs Care to *ſecure* the *intellectual* "World. When God made a Spirit *finite* and "*fallible*, he did intend to direct and govern it

(*g*) Strom. 7. p. 702. See *Teniſon* 372.

"by

" by a Spirit *infinite* and *infallible*." So far the Ancients and Moderns ſeem to agree; and to differ in this only, *who* the Spirit was; by whom this Direction and Government was carried-on.

The Opinion of the modern Chriſtians is this: that God did in the beginning crëate the World by *Jeſus Chriſt*; and afterwards make all his Revelations to our Fathers by *another Perſon*, who ſpeaks in the name of God, and is called in the moſt ſolemn manner by his Name, *Jehovah*, the Lord God merciful and gracious, long ſuffering and abundant in Goodneſs and Truth, &c(*h*).

This is the Character of the Angel, who lead our Fathers into *Canaan*, and was for many ages their Protector and Redeemer; whoſe Portion they are declared to be, and the lot of his inheritance; who found them in a deſert land and in the waſte howling Wilderneſs, and lead them about and inſtructed them, and kept them as the apple of his Eye(*i*); and declared to *Abraham*, that he would not leave him, till he had done all that he had ſpoken to him of (*k*); viz. That in his Seed ſhould all the Families of the Earth be bleſſed: and by the Prophet *Jeremiah*, that he would make a new Covenant with the Houſe of *Judah*(*l*). Notwithſtanding which, according to the opinion of ſome Chriſtians, This

(*h*) *Ex.* xxiv. 6.——xxiii. 21. (*i*) *Deut.* xxxii.
(*k*) *Gen.* xxviii. 14, 15. (*l*) *Jer.* xxxi.

Jehovah

Jehovah on a ſudden *diſappears*, and is *no more heard-of*; he is neither rewarded for the Afflictions he has undergone, nor concerned in the completion of his Promiſes. But *Jeſus Chriſt*, who is ſuppoſed to be a *different Perſon*, is introduced in his ſtead; and ſent into the World to conſummate the Scheme of Revelation and Salvation, which the Angel *Jehovah*, the Angel of the Covenant, had ſo carefully carried-on for many Ages: and this *Jeſus* in the New Teſtament is called the King of *Iſrael*. *Jo.* i. 49. though our Fathers knew no other Perſon by that Title, except the *Jehovah* who led them out of *Egypt:* and at length this ſame *Jeſus* dies, and is rewarded and *exalted* above all Principalities and Powers. And thus the *Angel of the Covenant* is ſuperſeded by *another* perſon; who ſucceeds to all his Titles, and accompliſhes all the Revelations which ſhould have been fulfilled, according to the Prophecies, by himſelf.

But the Opinion of the Ancient Fathers and Rabbins is much more *probable*, *conſiſtent*, *uniform* and *complete*. It ſuppoſes; that the whole ſcheme and deſign of God; in making, governing, and ſaving Mankind, or bringing them to Eternal Life; was begun, hath been all-along carried-on, and will be compleated, by one and *the ſame Jehovah*, the Meſſenger, Miniſter, or Angel of God; who is called by different Names, according to the different Offices he undertook;

(as the different Circumſtances of Mankind required) to procure the End for which he was ſent. That the God of the Univerſe, the God and Father of *Jeſus Chriſt*, *crëated* all things by the *Viſible Jehovah*, afterwards called the *Son of God*; and *governed* the World many Ages by him, as his *Miniſter*; giving him a peculiar power over the *Jewiſh* Nation, by whom he had lead them into the promiſed Land; and He was called their *God* and *King*: and during his government of them he was "afflicted in all "their afflictions, and his Soul was grieved for "their miſery, and he led them about and in-"ſtructed them, and kept them as the apple of "his Eye; and of his Love and his Pity he re-"deemed them, and carried them all the days "of Old: and yet ſuch was his Righteouſneſs, "and hatred of Iniquity; that, when they were "diſobedient, he turned to be their Enemy; "and fought againſt them:" but he never received any reward, in the Character of the *Jehovah Angel*, for all that he had done and ſuffered for the ſakes of them, and of the Reſt of Mankind in his government over them: the Reward of his Love to Man and Obedience to God being deferred, till he ſhould be made perfect or conſummated by much greater acts of benevolence and greater ſufferings than he had before gone through(*m*).—But afterwards, when it

(*m*) *Dan.* ix. 2, 4, 26.

pleaſed

pleaſed God to compleat the Scheme which he had predeſtinated and foretold by the Prophets; He ſent him into the World, in the Character of the *Meſſiah*, the *Son of Man*; to gather under one Lord and King both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, who had been long ſeparated; and to preach peace and forgiveneſs to all ſuch, as would become his Subjects, and live in Obedience to his Laws; in which Character he ſuffered great Affliction and Diſtreſs; and at laſt a ſhameful and cruel Death. And now, in reward of his meritorious Obedience, the power which he had in a peculiar manner over the *Jews*, as their *God* and *King*, was extended over the *Gentiles* alſo (*n*); and he was conſtituted the *Heir* of *all things*(*o*), and *Judge of all:* and the Salvation of Mankind, which he had from the beginning been ſollicitous to procure, was given into his own hands; and he received powers from God, which enabled him to compleat it; and was made a Prince and Saviour of the whole World he had made: and that Kingdom, which was prophecied of by *Daniel*, was given to him; which is to laſt for-ever; that is, to the End of the αἰὼν & μισθοδοσία· in which his Subjects ſhall be rewarded by him with Eternal Life, and reign together with him: and he himſelf is exalted above all Principalities and Powers; and there-

(*n*) *Iſ.* xlix. 6. (*o*) *Heb.* i. 2.

by farther enabled to advance the Virtue and Happineſs of God's Creatures in the moſt wiſe and proper manner through the whole Creation. —There is nothing in all this, contrary to the nature of Things, the reaſon of Mankind, or the Revelation given to *Moſes* and the Prophets; nor any thing at all improbable: but the whole Scheme is uniform and conſiſtent. And we cannot conceive a more noble Cataſtrophe to the Hiſtory of this World, and to the troubles and afflictions of various kinds, which the *Jehovah Angel* underwent in obedience to God in order to bring Men to Happineſs, while he ſtrove ſo many years with their obſtinacy and perverſeneſs, than the high State to which he is exalted, and thereby enabled to ſucceed in his Labours to the utmoſt of his Wiſhes; by giving eternal Life to every individual of the human race whom he will: *i. e.* to every one who ſhall live in the practice of Righteouſneſs and Truth.

Another Conſideration, which renders it more reaſonable and conſiſtent to ſuppoſe, *that the ſeveral Diſpenſations are carried on by the Same Being*, is this; That, if Chriſt be the Angel of the Covenant, all thoſe difficulties are avoided, which I have ſhewn to be inſuperable in the ſeveral heretical opinions mentioned in my Firſt Letter: as he is capable of anſwering every particular in the Prophecies relating to the Viſible *Jehovah*, and the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, and the

Meſſiah

Meſſiah promiſed to our Nation; and to every particular in the New Teſtament, relating to his perſon and office, his dignity and abaſement, his ſufferings and exaltation. As he could receive a Body, and thereby become a *Man*; ſo he could again put off that Body and die. R. *Solomon* on *Gen.* xix. 18. acknowledges; that the human Nature can be, and has been, aſſumed for a time; to which the *Talmud* agrees, under the Title, *Shebaioth* or *Sabboth*(*p*). But though he was the Angel of the Covenant, he was not an Angel in that low ſenſe in which it is objected to the *Arians*, as if they believed him but little ſuperior to Mankind; but in that ſenſe in which he is called ſo by *Paul* and *Stephen* and *Moſes*; i. e. a perſon ſent by God, ſuperior to the Angels (*q*); who are under his command(*r*), and pay worſhip to him (*s*); who is declared by *Moſes* to be the *Glory* of God, and the *Similitude* of God (*t*); and by the Chriſtians to be the brightneſs or *ray of his Glory*, and the expreſs image of his Perſon (*u*); and the whole of his character, (as it is deſcribed *Exod.* xxxiv. 5, 6.) is particular and perſonal, and deſigned to diſtinguiſh him from all other Angels and as ſuperior to them: for it is the Glory of *one particular* perſon, that was diſcovered; and the moral At-

(*p*) *Grot.* de Verit. Lib. v. Not. 18. 6. (*q*) *Heb.* i. 9. (*r*) *Mat.* xiii. 41. (*s*) *Heb.* i. 6. (*t*) *Numb.* xii. 8. (*u*) *Heb.* i. 3.

tributes

tributes of *one particular perſon*, which are there ſpecified; and not the moral Attributes of any particular *Speices* of Beings. Nor was He a *Man*, in the ſenſe, in which the *Socinians* uſe the word; when they confine it to mean a Being, who had no *Exiſtence*, before his *Birth* in this World; nor in that ſenſe, in which *Cicero* ſays, *Mens cujuſque is eſt Quiſque*; (for in that ſenſe he is of a Nature greatly ſuperior:) but he was a *Man*, in the common ſenſe of the word; i. e. *a Spiritual Being animating a Human Body*; in which ſenſe the word may include the higheſt Spiritual Being in Heaven, capable of Incarnation; as well as the loweſt upon Earth: according as we read that the Angel, with whom *Jacob* contended ſo long in prayer, is called by both names; *Aiſh*, or a *Man* (*x*): and *El*, *God* (*y*).

II. If we examine this Queſtion, [*whether the ſeveral Diſpenſations have not been carried-on by the Miniſtration of the ſame Angel,*] by the words of *Scripture*, we ſhall find; that the *Angel of the Covenant* is ſcarce ever, if at all, ſpoken of, under any of the Names and Characters above-mentioned; as the Angel of the *Preſence* or *Face* of God, the *God* of *Bethel*, the *Redeeming* Angel, &c. without ſome remarkable Circumſtance in the Context, directing us to ſome other part of the Hiſtory; where we find the *ſame Perſon* is

(*x*) *Gen.* xxxii. 24. (*y*) ibid. 30. *Hoſ.* xii. 3.

repre-

repreſented as acting under ſome *other* Name and Character: and by purſuing the Inquiry through the ſeveral references to which the Contexts direct us, we ſhall ſee Reaſon to conclude; that theſe *different* Names and Characters all centre at laſt in *one* and the *ſame* Perſon; as the Names adjoin'd to the word *Jehovah*, direct us to the *ſame Jehovah*; though the *appellatives* be different, according to the different *places* he appeared in; and the *actions* he performed; by which ſhort memorials the hiſtory of what had been tranſacted was conveyed down to Poſterity.

Thus, if we conſider the hiſtory of *Jacob* contending with the Angel in *Peniel* who chang'd his name to *Iſrael*; we find him called both a *Man*(*x*), and *God*(*y*): and *Jacob* called the name of the place *Peniel*, [the face of God] for I have ſeen God, *Face to Face*—And yet the Prophet *Hoſea*, ſpeaking of the ſame appearance to *Jacob*, ſays: he had power with *God*, yea, he had power over the *Angel* and prevailed; he wept and made Supplication unto him, he found him in *Bethel*, and there he ſpake with us: even *Jehovah*, *God of Hoſts*; *Jehovah* is his memorial(*z*).

Here the *ſame* Perſon, who is called a *Man*, is called the *Face* of *God*, and *God*, and an *Angel*,

(*x*) *Gen.* xxxii. 24. (*y*) ibid. 30. *Hoſ.* xii. 3.
(*z*) *Hoſ.* xii. 4, 5.

and

and *Jehovah God of Hosts*, and the Person to whom he made Supplication in *Bethel*. Let us turn to that Part of the History(*a*).

It was at *Bethel*, that *Jehovah* appeared to *Jacob* in a dream; and *Jacob* awaked and said, surely *Jehovah* is in this place; and he called it *Bethel*, [*the house of God*,] and set-up a Pillar and anointed it (*b*); and declared that *Jehovah* should be his God (*c*); and God calls himself *Jehovah* God of *Abraham*, and promises *Jacob* that in his seed shall all the families of the Earth be blessed (*d*); and yet we find(*e*), that it was the *Angel of God* who is here spoken of, who appeared to *Jacob* in a dream, and said, I am the *God* of *Bethel*, where thou anointedst the Pillar (*f*); and this same Person is called [*El Shaddai*] *God Almighty*(*g*), that appeared to him at *Luz* or *Bethel*(*h*). And *El Shaddai* was the same *Jehovah* who made the Covenant with *Abraham*, and after talking with him went up (*i*); and afterwards renew'd the promise to *Jacob*, by the name of *El Shaddai*; and went up in the place where he talked with him(*k*).

Again; the *Jehovah*, who appeared to *Moses* in the Bush(*l*), is called *Jehovah* and *Elohim*(*m*),

(*a*) *Gen.* xxviii. (*b*) v. 18. (*c*) v. 21. (*d*) v. 13, 14. (*e*) *Gen.* xxi. 11. (*f*) v. 13. (*g*) xlviii. (*h*) xxxv. 6. (*i*) xvii. 1, 22. (*k*) xxv. 13.
(*l*) *Ex.* iii. (*m*) v. 4.

and

and *I am*(*n*), and the *Jehovah* and *Elohim*, or Lord God of your Fathers and God of *Abraham*, &c. and this, ſays he, is my *memorial* unto all generations: and ſo in *Hoſea*, *Jehovah* is my *memorial*.—And yet this was not the *ſupreme God*, but his *Angel*; and ſo he is called in other places(*o*).

Moreover we read, that *Jehovah talked* with *Moſes*; and promiſed, that *his Face* or *himſelf* would go before the *Iſraelites* (*p*): and would proclaim the name of *Jehovah* before him, to ſhew that it was the ſame Angel who led them before in a Cloud andFlame of Fire; and *Jehovah* deſcended in a Cloud, and ſtood with *Moſes*, and proclaimed the name of *Jehovah*. From all which it appears; that this was the *viſible Jehovah*, or the *Angel of Jehovah*; agreeable to what God declared(*q*), that an *Angel* ſhould go before them; and that *His Name* was in him.

Now the Angel, who led them in the Wilderneſs, is called by *Iſaiah*, *Peniel*, or the Angel of the *Face* or *Preſence* of *God*; and the *Redeeming* Angel; [as he is called by *Jacob*(*r*),] and their *Saviour*(*s*). In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the *Angel of his Preſence* ſaved them, in his love and in his pity he *redeemed* them, and

(*n*) *Ex.* iii 14. (*o*) *Ex.* iii. 2. *Hoſ.* xii. 4. *Acts* vii. 30. (*p*) *Ex.* xxxiii. 9. (*q*) *Ex.* xxiii. 20. (*r*) *Gen.* xlviii. 16. (*s*) *Iſ.* lxiii.

he bare them and carried them, all the days of old: But they rebelled, and vexed his holy Spirit, &c. All this is plainly *perſonal*; and cannot be ſuppoſed to relate indiſcriminately to any Angel, whom God might ſend to reveal his Will; but to *one* Angel in *particular:* and directs to a more full account of the *ſame* Angel, in *Deut.* xxxii. 8. where we read, that we are *his People* and the *lot of his Inheritance.* For, when the Moſt High ſeparated the Sons of *Adam*, he ſet the bounds of the people according to the number of the Children of *Iſrael:* or, as we read it in the LXX, according to the number *of the Angels of God*(*t*). And this accounts-for his being called ſo particularly *the God of Iſrael*; under which name he appeared to *Aaron*, *Nadab* and *Abihu*, and the ſeventy Elders of *Iſrael* (*u*); and at the ſame time proves, that it could not be the *ſupreme God*, who is ſpoken-of in either of theſe Places; but One *particular Perſon*, who is called the *Elohim* of *Iſrael*, and is viſible. And it is very remarkable to the ſame purpoſe; that, when the three Angels appeared to *Abra-*

(*t*) *Euſebius* informs us frequently, that all the Nations of the Earth were formerly by Lot divided to many Angels; and this was the Doctrine of *Juſtin Martyr*, *Athenæus*, *Athenagoras*, and the two *Clements:* and R. *Menahem* ſays, God placed ſeventy Angels over the ſeventy Nations; and the Son of *Sirach* ſays, he ſet a Ruler over every People. *Eccleſ.* xvii. 17. (*u*) *Ex.* xxiv.

ham

ham in *Mamre*, One of them only is called *Jehovah*; both by *Abraham*, and by the two other Angels; and the other two are only called *Adonai*. See the Poſtſcript.

And we are aſſured by *Jeremiah*; that *Jehovah* who made the *old* Covenant, is the ſame that ſhould make the *new* One; chap. xxxi. though not according to the Covenant which he made with their Fathers, when he took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of *Egypt*. And *Zechariah* ſays, "Sing, O Daughter of *Zion*; for lo, I come and I will dwell in the midſt of thee, ſaith *Jehovah*; and many People ſhall be joined to *Jehovah* in that day, and ſhall be my People; and I will dwell in the midſt of Thee, and thou ſhalt know that the *Jehovah* of Hoſts hath ſent me unto Thee(*x*)." Here are manifeſtly *two Jehovahs*, the *Sender* and the *Sent*; of the latter of which it is ſaid, he ſhall inherit *Judah*, his Portion in the Holy Land; and can therefore mean no other perſon, than the very ſame Angel that is ſpoken-of *Deut.* xxxii. where we find that our Nation *was made the lot of his inheritance*; and the ſame whom *David* celebrates by the name *Jah*; *Pſ.* lxviii. 4. and deſcribes by *his going before his People and marching through the Wilderneſs*, ver. 7. and by his *goings* in the *Sanctuary*, and calls him his *God* and *King*,

(*x*) *Zech.* ii. 10, 11.

ver. 24. And when the Temple was built afterwards by *Solomon*, where the *Shechinah* appeared, and the Glory of God filled the Houſe(*y*), *Solomon* declares, that it was built for the *Name* of *Jehovah*, *God of Iſrael*(*z*); and prays that God would hear him in Heaven his dwelling place(*a*), when he prayed towards the Houſe which he built to his *Name*(*b*). For he ſaid, his *Name* ſhould be there(*c*). For all the People ſhould know his *Name*. And through the whole chapter *Solomon* preſerves a plain diſtinction between the *Name* of God, or the *Jehovah Angel*, who dwelt between the *Cherubim* and appeared in Glory on the Mercy-ſeat; and the *God of the Univerſe*, whom he declares the Heaven and the Heaven of Heavens cannot contain(*d*). And this diſtinction is preſerved in the *Jeruſalem Targum*(*e*), which runs thus; "You have made the "*Word of the Lord* King over you this day, "that He may be your Glory; the *Word of the* "*Lord* is become King over you in his own "Name, as over his beloved and peculiar Peo-"ple." Here his acting as King in *his own* Name is oppoſed to his acting in the Name of *God:* and accordingly, *Zechariah* calls him the

(*y*) I *Kings*, viii. 10, 11. (*z*) ver. 20. (*a*) I *Kings*, viii. ver. 32, 34, 36, 39, 43. (*b*) ver. 20, 44, 48. (*c*) ver. 29. (*d*) ver. 27. (*e*) on *Deut.* xxvi. 17, 18.

King

King of *Zion*; and deſcribes his *Dominion* to be to the ends of the Earth. Hence it appears, that *all theſe Characters* centre in one and the ſame Perſon: ſo that *Peniel*, the *Face of God*; *El Bethel*, the God of *Bethel*; *El Shaddai*, God *Almighty*; the *Redeeming Angel*, the *Angel* of the *old* and *new Covenants*, the God of *Iſrael*, the *God* of *Hoſts*, the *Name* of *God*, &c. are but different *Names* of one and the ſame *Angel*.

To confirm this, we may obſerve; that it no where appears through the whole Scripture, that our Fathers were ever delivered into the hand of *any other*, than that *one* Angel, to be their guide and conduct them; in *whom* God put his *Name* (*f*); as a particular mark of Diſtinction and Honour: and *no other* is called *Jehovah*, or is ever ſaid to have appeared in *Shechinah*; though others were ſeen on ſeveral Occaſions; as when they met *Jacob* on the way, and he ſaid, this is *God's Hoſt* (*g*). And no other is called our *God* and *King*, to whom the Patriarchs were commanded to build *Altars*. And but one in whom God has put his name, and deſcribed by his perſonal Attributes, which prove him to be conſidered as an Individual. And it is here that the *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian* Scriptures are in ſo extraordinary a manner connected in the ſame belief; that there is One *viſible* God

(*f*) *Exod.* xxiii. 21. xxiv. 6. (*g*) *Gen.* xxxii. 2.

and

and King to reign over them, and *but* One whom they call *Emmanuel*(*h*).

To this purpoſe *Ezekiel* ſays, "*David* my Servant ſhall be King over them; and *they all* ſhall have *one* Shepherd, and my Servant *David* ſhall be their *Prince* for-ever, and I will ſet *one Shepherd* over them, and he ſhall feed them; even my Servant *David*, and he ſhall be *their Shepherd*(*hh*). And this *Shepherd* of *Iſrael* is called by *Jehovah* of Hoſts *my Shepherd* and *my Fellow*(*i*): and in *Pſ.* lxxx. this *Shepherd* is deſcribed as *dwelling between the Cherubim* (*k*); and therefore can be no other than the *ſame* who dwelt in the Tabernacle, and had his Dwelling in the Buſh (*l*); and is called an Angel(*m*). *Hoſea* ſays, "The Children of *Iſrael* ſhall return and ſeek *Jehovah* their *God*, and *David* their *King*; and ſhall fear *Jehovah* in the latter days(*n*). And *Iſaiah* ſays, "Their King ſhall be raiſed up to *David*: and of the Increaſe of his Government and Peace there ſhall be no end upon the Throne of *David*(*o*)." And *Micah* ſays, "*Jehovah* ſhall reign over them in Mount *Zion*; even for ever (*p*). And that the *Ruler in Iſrael* who ſhall come forth from *Bethlehem Ephrata* is he, whoſe *goings-forth have been of old from everlaſting* (*q*):

(*h*) *Iſ.* vii. 14. *Mat.* i. 23. (*hh*) *Ezek.* xxxiv. 23. xxxvii. 24, 25. (*i*) *Zech.* xiii. 7. (*k*) *Pſ.* lxxx. 1. (*l*) *Deut.* xxxiii. 16. (*m*) *Acts* vii. 30. (*n*) *Hoſ.* iii. 5. (*o*) *Iſ.* ix. 7. (*p*) *Mic.* iv. 7. (*q*) *Mic.* v. 2.

which

which agrees with what *David* ſays in celebrating *Jah*(*r*). Laſtly, we find alſo in *Daniel*; that a *Lord* and *King* was expected by the *Jews*, who was to reign over them for-ever; and *Daniel* calls him *Meſſiah the Prince*, whoſe Kingdom ſhould never be deſtroyed. And the *Chriſtian* Scriptures allow, that this Perſon was the *Meſſiah*; as I ſhall hereafter ſhew: and that he is *Emmanuel*; and that we ſhall be ſaved by no other name under Heaven; and that his Dominion ſhall be extended over all the Earth; and all that the Angel promiſed to *Jacob* ſhall be fulfilled by him in the bleſſings which were to come upon all the families of the Earth. And this is what the Evangeliſts aſſure us; that the Angel *Gabriel* declared of *Jeſus Chriſt* at his Birth; agreeably to all the Prophecies already quoted: "He ſhall be great, and ſhall be called the Son of the Higheſt; and the Lord ſhall give unto him the *Throne* of his Father *David*: and he ſhall reign over the Houſe of *Jacob* for-ever; and of his *Kingdom* there ſhall be no end(*s*). This was likewiſe the Title, which *Chriſt* himſelf claimed: as appears by the Queſtion, which *Pilate* aſked; and his Anſwer to it Art thou the King of the *Jews?* ſays *Pilate*: To which *Jeſus* anſwered, Thou ſayſt(*t*). And this it was, for which he was condemned: the

(*r*) *Pſ.* lxviii. (*s*) *Luke* i. 32, 33. (*t*) *Mat.* xxvii. 2. *Mark* xv. 2.

Sum

Sum of the Charge brought againſt him being this, that he forbad Tribute to be paid to *Cæſar*; ſaying, he himſelf is *Chriſt*, a *King*(*u*). And it was on Account of this Claim, that they adorned him in Purple, with a Crown on his Head, and a Reed in his Hand; and bowed the Knee before him, ſaying; Hail, *King* of the *Jews*. And when the high Prieſt aſked him, Art thou the *Chriſt*—the Son of God (*x*)? he mean'd to aſk the very ſame Queſtion, which *Pilate* had aſked juſt before: for they underſtood the *Chriſt*, the *Son* of *God*, and the *King* of the *Jews*, to mean the ſame Perſon. And the Anſwer which he gave, was complete and determinate to the full Senſe of the Queſtion. *Jeſus* ſaid, Ye ſay that I am; that is, *I am:* and ye ſhall ſee the Son of Man ſitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the Clouds of Heaven(*y*). By theſe Words he declared himſelf openly and without diſguiſe, to be the Son of Man prophecied of by *Daniel*; who ſhould receive a

(*u*) *Luke* xxiii. 2. (*x*) *Luke* xxii. 67, 70. *John* i. 49. (*y*) *Mat.* xxvi. 64. *Chriſt* here refers to the Prophecy of *Daniel*, that the Son of Man ſhould come with the Clouds of Heaven. *Dan.* vii. 13. Hence *Anani*, the *Hebrew* word for *Clouds*, was made a known name among the *Jews* for the *Meſſiah*; So that this anſwer was a confeſſion, well underſtood by them, that *Chriſt* was *Anani*; or *Daniel*'s Son of Man that comes in the Clouds. The Biſhop of *Lichfield* and *Coventry* quotes *Jarchi* and others, in proof of this; p. 108.

king-

kingdom from the Moſt High, which ſhould laſt for-ever, and over all Nations. So that both *Jews* and *Chriſtians* not only agree, that there is but *One*; who is to *reign* over all Nations: but they alſo agree, that this is *Meſſiah*, the *Prince*; the ſame, whom *Malachi* declares to be the *Angel* of the *Covenant*; whom I have ſhewn to be the ſame that conducted our Fathers under the Name of *Jehovah*.

And accordingly, when *Jehovah* declares, *I will have Mercy upon the Houſe of Iſrael; and I will ſave them by* Jehovah *their God*(*z*). *And I will ſtrengthen them in* Jehovah, *and they ſhall walk up and down in his Name; ſaith* Jehovah(*a*). *And the* Jehovah *of* Zion *ſhall dwell in the Midſt of his People; and they ſhall know that* Jehovah *of Hoſts hath ſent me*(*b*). The *Jehovah* by whom the ſupreme *Jehovah* will *ſave* us, and by whom we ſhall be *ſtrengthened*, and who was to be *ſent* by the *Jehovah* of Hoſts, can be no other Perſon; than he, whom the Chriſtians call *Emmanuel*; of whom *Paul* ſays, there is one *Mediator* between God and Man; the Man *Chriſt Jeſus*(*c*). For there is neither *Jew* nor *Chriſtian*, who believes, that any *other Jehovah* appeared among Men with power to *ſave*; or that we are *ſaved*

(*z*) *Hoſea* i. 7. (*a*) *Zech.* x. 12. (*b*) *Zech.* ii. 9.
(*c*) I *Tim.* ii. 5.

by any *other* Perſon; or that any other can be called *Emmanuel.*

And therefore I conclude; that all the *Appearances* of *Jehovah*, and all the *Converſations* we read of between a *viſible Jehovah* and Man, were made by the *Angel of the Covenant.* That in the beginning when God ſaid, *Let us make Man* (*d*); he ſaid it to the *Son*, and not to *Himſelf*; and that "the *Son* wrought in the Crëation, upon the *Father*'s iſſuing out his *Fiat* or command for it: and that God the *Son* always acted in the *Father's name*; as ſeems to have been the Opinion of *Philo*, and as *Tertullian* long ago profeſſed(*e*). *Profitemur Chriſtum ſemper egiſſe in Dei Patris nomine:* and again; *Filius viſus eſt ſemper*; *& Filius converſatus eſt ſemper*; *& Filius operatus eſt ſemper*; *ex Auctoritate Patris & Voluntate*(*f*).

As I had juſt finiſhed theſe pages, *Ben Saddai* happened to call upon me; and I ſhewed him what I had written, and aſked him what he thought of it. The Old Man ſmiled, and ſaid; he was very well ſatisfied that the *Meſſiah* was the *Angel* of the *Covenant*; and he thought it one of the ſtrongeſt Objections againſt the *Chriſtians*, that it is no part of *their Revelation.* "A "Doctrine of ſuch importance, ſays he, if their "Religion came from God, would certainly be

(*d*) *Gen.* i. 26. (*e*) Lib. 2 cont. *Marc.* (*f*) ad. *Prax.* Sect. 16. p. 509. *Teniſon* on Idol. 315.

"re-

" revealed to *Them*, concerning *Their Meſſiah*,
" in *Their* Scriptures; as well as it is to *Us*,
" concerning the *true Meſſiah*, in *Ours*. And if
" it does not appear, that *Chriſt* and his Apoſ-
" tles preached any *ſuch* Doctrine, or knew of
" any *ſuch* Thing: you may be ſure, it is all a
" mere invention of their Followers ſince: to
" ſolve appearances, and prop a bad Cauſe from
" ſinking. He added; that the *Jehovah Angel*
" is *never once* mentioned, in the *Chriſtian* Scrip-
" tures; but *Another Perſon* introduced to ſup-
" ply his Office; whom our Fathers have not
" known; and placed in a ſuperior Station to
" him; which the Chriſtians finding to be *inde-*
" *fenſible*, they are now endeavouring to *com-*
" *promiſe* matters, by pretending they are *One*
" and the *Same* Perſon; attributing all the *Cha-*
" *racters* of the *Jehovah Angel* to *Jeſus Chriſt*;
" though there is nothing in their Evangeliſts to
" bear them out in this moſt material part of
" his Character. And whereas They ought to
" prove him from their Scriptures to be the
" *Angel* of the *Covenant*, in order to his anſwer-
" ing the *Character* given of the *Meſſiah* by
" *Malachi:* they firſt take it for granted, that
" *He, Jeſus*, is the *Meſſiah*; and from thence
" argue, that He is the *Angel* of the *Covenant:*
" which, if it were true, *Chriſt* and his Apoſ-
" tles muſt have known it; and mentioned it
" over and over. In ſhort, *My* Argument,

" ſays he, againſt you and your new Friends is " this; If *Chriſt* were the *true Meſſiah*, he would " be the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, the *viſible Jeho-* " *vah*; but, as he hath never claimed this " Character to himſelf, nor his Apoſtles for " him; he does not anſwer the Deſcription " which the Prophet *Malachi* hath given of him; " and therefore cannot be the *Meſſiah* we ex- " pected:" and he referred me to Mr. Collins' ſcheme of literal Prophecy, who makes the ſame Objection in page 120(*g*). I thought this worth your Attention; and ſhall give you the ſum of my anſwer, which I ſent him in a Letter a few days after.

In the 1ſt place, I obſerved; that the word *Jehovah*, the *proper name* of the ſupreme, ſelf-exiſtent God; and by which name the *Angel* of the *Covenant* was called, (becauſe he ſupported the *Character* and *Perſon* of the ſupreme God, and acted in his name:) could not be ſo *properly* applied to him, in the *New Teſtament*; after he had *ceaſed to ſupport* that Character, and acted as the *Meſſiah* in a Character of *his own*; and was to have a Kingdom, and gather Subjects into it, and act in his *own Name*.

2dly, Whether it were *proper* or *no*, it is certain that the *Greek* Verſion both in the LXX and

(*g*) Mr. Collins' reaſoning upon it is conſidered in Letter IV.

in

in the *New Teſtament*, tranſlate the words *Jehovah* and *Adonai* by the ſame word Κύριος: and this, not only by way of *Explication*, but of *Diſtinction* and *particular Expreſſion*. Thus we read(*b*), that Men may know *that Thou, whoſe name alone is* Jehovah, *art the moſt high over all the Earth*: and the LXX read it, καὶ γνώτωσαν ὅτι ὄνομά σοι ΚΥΡΙΟΣ; and when God ſays, *I appeared unto* Abraham, *and unto* Iſaac, *and unto* Jacob, *by my name* [El Shaddai] *God Almighty*; *but by my name* Jehovah *was I not known to them* (*i*); the LXX tranſlate καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου ΚΥΡΙΟΣ οὐκ ἐδήλωσα αὐτοῖς· and again, thus ſhalt thou ſay unto the Children of *Iſrael*; Jehovah, *the God of your Fathers hath ſent me unto you*; the LXX tranſlate, ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων, &c. This being the Caſe, it is manifeſt; that *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles, who uſed the *Greek* Tranſlation of the LXX, did not refrain from the uſe of the Word *Jehovah*, becauſe they did not mean to ſpeak of *Jehovah* or his Angel; who are both called by that name in the Old Teſtament; but becauſe the Word Κύριος was the Word then in uſe to expreſs *Jehovah* as well as *Adonai*; as it is uſed *Pſ.* cx. 1. quoted, *Mat.* xxii. 44. to expreſs them both: *Jehovah* ſaid unto my Lord, Εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ Κυρίῳ μου· LXX—See *Acts* iv. 26. againſt the Lord, τοῦ Κυρίου, and againſt his *Chriſt*, or his Anointed.

(*b*) *Pſ.* lxxxiii. 18. (*i*) *Ex.* vi. 3.

And

And therefore, as the word Κύριος is conſtantly uſed in the LXX and *New Teſtament* to expreſs the Word *Jehovah*, in a *particular* Senſe; as well as the Word *Lord*, in a *general* One; we can avail ourſelves of no ſuch Conſequence as *Ben Saddai* hath drawn: But have reaſon to conclude, that Κύριος means *Jehovah*, in many places of the New Teſtament, where the word Κύριος is uſed; as it moſt certainly does in all thoſe texts, which are taken from the *Old Teſtament*: where *Jehovah* is the Κύριος referred-to.

In ſhort, the ſame Argument by which *Ben Saddai* would prove that the *Jehovah Angel* is never ſpoken-of in the *New Teſtament*, under the name Κύριος, will prove alſo; that the *ſupreme Jehovah* is never there ſpoken-of under *that name*: which we know to be falſe; as appears from the Texts already referred-to. And in the ſame manner it may be ſhewn, from the many Texts of the *Old Teſtament*, tranſlated in the *New*, which refer-to the *Jehovah Angel*; that He is alſo ſpoken-of under *that* Title. To this purpoſe, Mr. *Ainſworth*, on *Gen.* ii. 4. inſtances *Rom.* x. 9. "If thou ſhalt confeſs, that *Jeſus* "is the *Lord*; i. e. *Jehovah*; as he is named, "*Jer.* xxiii, 6. So, I *Cor.* xii. 3. No man can "ſay, that *Jeſus* is the *Lord*; i. e. *Jehovah*; but "by the Holy Ghoſt." Now it is certain; that if the original Word *Jehovah* had been preſerved in

in the Tranſlation of theſe Texts, inſtead of Κύριος, the proof that *Jeſus* is called *Jehovah* would be indiſputable.

But it is not much leſs certain in the *Tranſlation*, than in the *Original*. For if we conſider, that the *Chriſtian* Revelation was originally made to the *Jews*; to whom *Chriſt* was ſent a Miniſter of the Circumciſion, for the Truth of God to confirm the promiſes made to our Fathers (*k*); that *Chriſt* was himſelf a *Jew*, and all his Apoſtles; and that the Word Κύριος is uſed by them in an abſolute *ſenſe*, when ſpeaking to our Nation; we muſt conclude, that they could mean no *other* Perſon than *Jehovah*; nor could it poſſibly be underſtood by a *Jew* in any *other* ſenſe: for they knew no *other* Κύριος, or Lord. If they ſpake-of an *inviſible* Lord in an *abſolute* ſenſe, they could underſtand no other *Lord*, but the *ſupreme* Lord and Governor of the Univerſe: and if they ſpake-of a *viſible* Lord in an *abſolute* ſenſe, they could underſtand no other Perſon, but the *ſame* who revealed the will of God to *Moſes*. But farther——

Though the Word *Jehovah* be not uſed in the *New Teſtament* at all, either of *God* or *Chriſt*; yet as the *inviſible Lord* there ſpoken-of is known by his Attributes to be *no other* Perſon than the *ſupreme Jehovah*; ſo the *viſible Lord* there ſpo-

(*k*) *Rom.* xv. 8. *Mat.* xv. 24. *Acts* iii. 26—xiii. 46.

ken

ken-of may be no leſs certainly known, by his Deſcription and Character, to be no other Perſon than the *Jehovah Angel*.

Ben Saddai objects, that the *Chriſtians arbitrarily* declare *Chriſt* to be the *Meſſiah*; and from thence aſſume a right of ſaying he is the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, and every thing elſe that is declared of the *Meſſiah* in the Prophets; without any Authority from their own Scriptures. But this I deny; and ſhall take upon me to ſhew, that they aſſume no more than their Scriptures will warrant them to do; which will be amply ſufficient to aſcertain the Perſon of *Chriſt* and the viſible *Jehovah* to be the ſame. And the proofs drawn from the *Chriſtian* Scriptures, that *Jeſus* is the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, are theſe.

1. It is very remarkable; that all the Evangeliſts, in the beginning of their Goſpels, where they deſcribe the *Perſon* of the *Meſſiah* and the Connection between the Old and New Teſtament, have expreſſed themſelves ſo clearly upon this Subject; as to be liable to no Miſtake. St. *Matthew*(*l*), ſpeaking of *John* the Harbinger of *Chriſt*, tells us expreſsly; "This is *He* that was ſpoken-of by the Prophet *Iſaias*; ſaying, the Voice of one crying in the Wilderneſs, prepare the way of the *Lord*, make his paths ſtraight." St. *Mark* alſo begins his Goſpel in the ſame

(*l*) *Mat.* iii. 3.

man-

manner(*m*). "The beginning of the Goſpel of *Jeſus Chriſt*, the Son of God: as it is written in the Prophets, Behold I ſend my Meſſenger before thy face, which ſhall prepare thy way before Thee; The Voice of one crying in the Wilderneſs, Prepare ye the way of the *Lord*, make his paths ſtraight (*n*);" and the ſame Prophecies are quoted by St. *Luke*(*o*), and by St. *John*, as the Teſtimony of *John* the Baptiſt(*p*). Now in the original Prophecy of *Iſaiah*, the Words are theſe. "Prepare ye the way of *Jehovah*:" and conſequently the *Chriſt*, whoſe way the *Baptiſt* was to prepare, is here conſidered by the Evangeliſt to be the ſame perſon whom *Iſaiah* calls *Jehovah*; i. e. the *Jehovah* who was ſo often promiſed to our Fathers to come and ſave them, and dwell among them, and bring in a new Covenant; as it is prophecied by *Jeremiah*(*q*). "Behold the days come, ſaith the Lord *Jehovah*; that I will make a new Covenant with the houſe of *Iſrael* and with the houſe of *Judah*; not according to the Covenant that I made with their Fathers," &c. Here we find *all* the four Evangeliſts bearing witneſs to the ſame thing; that *Jeſus* is the *Jehovah* prophecied of by *Iſaiah*: whoſe way the *Baptiſt* was to prepare. And if this was not ſo underſtood by them, it had been impoſſible they ſhould found their Goſpels upon this

(*m*) *Mark* i. 1. (*n*) *Iſ.* xl. 3. *Mal.* iii. 1. (*o*) *Luke* i. 76. (*p*) i. 23. (*q*) *Jer.* xxxi. 31.

Prophecy; which upon ſuch a ſuppoſition, muſt be nothing to the purpoſe.

2. It appears from *Moſes*, that "*God* (*Elohim*) crëated the Heavens and the Earth;" it was *God* that commanded, and they were crëated: by the *Word* of *Jehovah* were the Heavens made, and all the hoſt of them by the breath of his Mouth: or by his command. And nobody can doubt, that the Apoſtles of *Chriſt* believed this. And yet St. *John* tells us, and his Words are very remarkable: "In the beginning was the *Word*, and the *Word* was with *God*, and the *Word* was *God:* All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made, that was made(*r*)." And by the *Word* he means *Jeſus Chriſt*. But how could theſe things be conſiſtent; unleſs the Evangeliſt believed, that *Jeſus Chriſt* was the *Elohim*, who appeared all along in the Old Teſtament under the Title of *God*; or the *Angel of the Lord*; by whom God at firſt created all things: *i. e.* the Viſible *Jehovah*, or *Word* of *God*; as he is called by *Philo* and the *Jews* of that age?

To this we may add the Teſtimony of St. *Paul*; who tells us, that *God* crëated all things by *Jeſus Chriſt* (*s*); and ſpeaks in the name of the Father to the Son, ſaying; "Thou, Lord, in the beginning haſt laid the foundations of the

(*r*) *John* i. 1, 3. (*s*) *Eph.* iii. 9.

Earth;

Earth; and the Heavens are the work of thy hands(*t*)." And again he tells us; "*Chriſt* is the Image of the *Inviſible* God, the Firſt-born of the whole Crëation; πάσης κτίσεως· and that by him were all things crëated, that are in Heaven and are in Earth, viſible and inviſible; whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers; all things were crëated *by* him, and *for* him(*u*)." In like manner, St. *Peter* tells us; "For this they [the *Heathens*] willingly are ignorant of; that by the *Word* of *God* the Heavens were of Old: and by the ſame *Word* the Heavens and Earth are kept in Store, reſerved unto Fire (*x*); and *by Him* all things conſiſt(*y*)." Now if the World was made by the *Word* of God, or by the Image of the inviſible God; whom *John*, *Paul* and *Peter* all agree to be the *Chriſt*; they muſt all underſtand him to be the viſible *Jehovah*; agreeably to the common Language of thoſe Times.

3. This farther appears from the particulars, by which the *Chriſt* and the Viſible *Jehovah* are deſcribed. The Apoſtle tells us, that Chriſt had been ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ· in the *Form* of *God*. Now this expreſſion anſwers exactly to the deſcription of the *Jehovah Angel*, who is called the *Face* or *Preſence* of God; πρόσωπον Θεοῦ. And as the *Jehovah Angel* is ſaid, in the book of *Num-*

(*t*) *Pſ.* cii. 25. (*u*) *Col.* i. 15, 16. II *Peter* iii. 5.
(*x*) II *Peter* iii. (*y*) *Col.* i. 17.

bers, [xii. 8.] to be the *Similitude* of *Jehovah*; ſo in the Chriſtian Scriptures the ſame Character is obſerved of *Chriſt*; and he is ſaid to be the *Brightneſs* or *Ray* of his Glory, and the *expreſs Image* of his Perſon(z), and the *Image* of the *inviſible God*(a). And as the ſame Perſon is by *Moſes*(b) called an *Angel* of *Jehovah*, as well as *Jehovah*; and by *Hoſea*(c) and *Zechariah* the *Angel* of *God*, as well as *God*(d). So is *Chriſt*, in the Chriſtian Scriptures, called both *God*, and an *Angel* of *God*(e). And therefore they both anſwer the ſame Character: which no other Being in the Univerſe does.

4. St. *John*, ſpeaking of the Glory of *Chriſt*, ſays; that we beheld his *Glory*, the Glory as of the *Only-begotten of the Father*. Now the Only begotten of the Father, according to the Language of thoſe Times, was the *viſible Jehovah*; whom *Philo* calls the *Son of God*, and the *Firſt-begotten* of the Father before all Creatures; and the *Word of God*: And his Glory was the *Shechinah*, or δόξα θεοῦ, mentioned ſo often in the LXX Tranſlation. And as this Text is underſtood, by ſome Commentators, to compare the Glory of *Chriſt* to the Glory of the *Only begotten of the Father*; and by the Compariſon to ſhew what kind of Glory *Chriſt*'s was; the *Glory* of the

(z) *Heb.* i. 3. (a) *Col.* i. 15. (b) *Ex.* iii. 2, 4, 6. (c) *Hoſea* xii. 4. (d) *Zech.* xii. 8. (e) *Acts* vii. 30, 32. 35, 38, &c. *Gal.* iv. 14.

Only

Only-begotten of the Father muſt be conſidered here as a *known* thing. But the Glory of the Only-begotten of the Father, as known to the *Jews*, and ſo often mentioned in the Old Teſtament; was no other than the *Shechinah*.

But we are told, by *Piſcator* and others; that the particle ὡς, (as) does not here ſignify *Similitude*; but *Reality* or *Certainty*: and if ſo the words muſt be; "we beheld his Glory, *namely* the Glory or *Shechinah* of the Only-begotten of the Father; and, as Dr. *Hammond* explains it, ſuch a Glory as was incompatible with any other but the *True Eternal Son of God*." And this ſeems to be the right meaning.

But the *Shechinah*, in which Chriſt appeared, when he was transfigured in the preſence of the three Apoſtles, *Peter*, *James* and *John*, which is here alluded-to; was not appropriated to the *eternal Son of God*, or the *Only-begotten of the Father*; if the ſame Perſon was not alſo the *viſible Jehovah*: as will appear by comparing the divine Glory in which *Chriſt* then appeared, with the Glory in which the *Jehovah Angel* appeared to our Fathers.

Now the Glory in which *Chriſt* appeared is deſcribed by *Matthew*, *Mark*, and *Luke* (*f*); and the Hiſtory is as follows. *Chriſt* had promiſed to his Diſciples, ſaying; "there be ſome

(*f*) *Mat.* xvii. 1. *Mark* ix. 2. *Luke* ix. 28.

ſtanding

ſtanding here, which ſhall not taſte of Death; till they ſee the Son of Man coming in his *kingdom:*" and about ſix or eight days afterwards, *Jeſus* taketh *Peter* and *James*, and *John* his brother, and bringeth them up into a high Mountain apart; and his Countenance was altered and his Face did ſhine as the Sun, and his Raiment was glittering and white, as the Light; ſo white, as no Fuller on Earth could whiten it: and a Cloud over-ſhadowed them, and they feared as they entered into the Cloud: and when the Apoſtle gives an account of ſeeing the ſame Glory *in Viſion*, he ſays; his Countenance was as the Sun ſhining in his ſtrength(*g*).

But this Deſcription of the Glory of *Chriſt* is the ſame with that which is given by *Moſes*; when he deſcribes the appearance of the *viſible Jehovah* in the Mount(*h*). "And *Moſes* went up into the Mount, and a Cloud covered the Mount, and the Glory of *Jehovah* abode upon Mount *Sinai*—and the Sight of the Glory (*i*) of *Jehovah* was like devouring fire on the Top of the Mount, in the Eyes of the Children of *Iſrael*; and *Moſes* went into the Midſt of the Cloud." And in other places we read(*k*), that a Cloud covered the Congregation; and the Glory of *Jehovah* appeared in the Cloud, and filled the Tabernacle; and *Moſes* was not able to enter

(*g*) *Rev.* i. 16. (*h*) *Ex.* xxiv. 15, 16, 17, 18.
Aſpectus Angeli Dei. Arab. (*k*) *Ex.* xl. 34, 35.

into

into the Tent of the Congregation, becauſe the Cloud abode thereon.

Now theſe two deſcriptions are the ſame, in every particular. The *Glory* is compared to *Light* and *Fire*, in both of them; and in both we find the appearance of a *Cloud*; and both *Moſes* and the *Apoſtles* fearful of entering into the Cloud. And it was the ſight of this *Glory*, as being the ſame which uſed to reſt upon the Tabernacle of Old, that put it into *Peter's* thoughts to build a *New Tabernacle* for it's reception now; that the *Glory of the Lord* might continue among them in the Tabernacle he ſhould then build; as it uſed to do in former times in the *Old* Tabernacle. But in the Confuſion of mind he then was, he purpoſed to build Tabernacles alſo for *Moſes* and *Elias*.

5. But farther: in the ſame manner as *Moſes* refers to this appearance of the *Shechinah*; ſo do the Prophets and Apoſtles to the Glory of *Chriſt*. *Moſes* had ſaid(*l*), *Jehovah* thy God is a *conſuming Fire*; even a jealous God: So St. *Paul* referring to the *Glory of Chriſt*, ſays; "The Lord will appear in *flaming Fire*, taking Vengeance(*m*), and deſtroy with the *Brightneſs* of his coming(*n*). And it is with reference to this Glory, that *John* in the *Apocalypſe* ſays, of the Heavenly *Jeruſalem*; the City had no need of the Sun, neither

(*l*) *Deut.* iv. 24—ix. 3. (*m*) II *Theſſ.* i. 7, 8. (*n*) II *Theſſ.* ii. 8.

of

of the Moon to ſhine in it; for the *Glory* of God, δόξα Θεοῦ, did enlighten it; and the *Lamb* is the Light thereof:" But by the Lamb is mean'd *Chriſt*. Here then the Apoſtle plainly declares *Chriſt* to be the *Shechinah*; and conſequently, the viſible *Jehovah*.

6. It is thought, by many learned men; that the Brightneſs of the *Shechinah* was the Glory of the *Angel* of the *Preſence*, and of his attendant Spirits or Miniſters; and that in relation to this appearance it is ſaid(*o*), "*Jehovah* came from *Sinai*, and roſe up from *Seir* unto them: he ſhined forth from Mount *Paran*, and he came with ten thouſand of Saints: from his right-hand went a fiery Law for them." So alſo, in the *Pſalms* (*p*): "The Chariots of God are twenty thouſand; even thouſands of Angels; *Jehovah* is among them as in *Sinai*, in the holy place:" And ſo, in *Daniel*(*q*), the *Shechinah* of the ſupreme *Jehovah* is thus deſcribed in *Viſion*; "A fiery Stream iſſued and came forth from before him; thouſand thouſands miniſtred unto him, and ten thouſand times ten thouſand ſtood before him." From theſe Texts, and from its being ſaid in *their* Scriptures(*r*), "the Law was given by *Angels*," it is ſuppoſed by the Chriſtians; that the *Shechinah*, or *Glory*, was made by the preſence of the *Jehovah Angel*, accompanied

(*o*) *Deut.* xxxiii. 2. (*p*) *Pſ.* xviii. 17. (*q*) *Dan.* vii. 10. (*r*) *Acts* vii. 53.

by

by his Attendants. But whether it be ſo or no, for there is no proof that the Angels did or did not compoſe any part of the Glory: it is however very remarkable, that the *Apoſtles* ſpeak of the appearance of *Chriſt* at the Day of Judgment in the very ſame language as the *Prophets* ſpeak of the apearance of the *Jehovah Angel*. "The Son of Man ſhall come in the *Glory* of his Father(*s*)—When the Son of Man ſhall come in his *Glory*, and all the holy Angels with him; then ſhall he ſit upon the throne of his *Glory*(*t*) —The Lord *Jeſus* ſhall be revealed from Heaven with his mighty *Angels*(*u*)—Of him ſhall the Son of Man be aſhamed; when he cometh in the *Glory* of his Father, with the holy *Angels*(*x*)." Now as the New-Teſtament Writers deſcribe their *Emmanuel* in the ſame *Glory* and Attendance, as *Moſes* and the Prophets deſcribe the *Angel Jehovah*; it is a ſtrong Argument that they conſidered him as the ſame Perſon.

But St. *John* in another place has decided this Queſtion beyond all diſpute; by declaring the *Glory* which *Iſaiah* ſaw, and which was undeniably the *Glory* of the viſible *Jehovah*, to be the *Glory* of *Chriſt* himſelf. Theſe Things ſaid *Iſaiah*, when he ſaw his [*Chriſt's*] *Glory*; and

(*s*) *Mat.* xvi. 27. (*t*) xxv. 31. (*u*) II *Theſſ.* i. 7. (*x*) *Mark* viii. 38.

ſpake of him(y). Now the Words which *John* quotes from the Prophet, we find in *Iſaiah* vi. 1. where the Prophet deſcribes the *Glory* of the viſible *Jehovah*, as follows. "I ſaw alſo *Jehovah* ſitting upon his Throne, high and lifted up (*i. e.* upon the Mercy Seat) and his train filled the Temple: [πλήρης ὁ οἶκος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ· ſay the LXX.] above him ſtood the *Cherubim*; each had ſix Wings, &c." The whole account is grand and magnificent, and deſcriptive of the *Shechinah* on the Mercy Seat between the two *Cherubim*; where the *Angel Jehovah* uſed to appear: and accordingly the Prophet ſays, "mine Eyes have ſeen the *Jehovah* of Hoſts." But *John* tells us; this *Glory*, which the Prophet ſaw, was the *Glory* of *Chriſt*: and conſequently he declares, that *Chriſt* is the *Viſible Jehovah*, or the *Jehovah of Hoſts*; as he is called *Hoſ.* xii. 5. and in other places(z).

7. We read; that *Jehovah* ſtood upon the Rock in *Horeb*; and ordered *Moſes* to ſmite the Rock: and the Waters flowed out of the Rock, and the name of the place was called *Maſſah* and

(y) *John* xii. 41. For *Chriſt* was he, whoſe Glory *Iſaiah* ſaw; as St. *John* doth teſtify: for of him the Apoſtle ſpeaketh in this place, and of none but him. See *Pearſon* p. 125. Dr. *Whitby*, edit. 3. p. 321. explains this Viſion of the Glory of *Chriſt* not of God the Father, and conſequently this was the viſible *Jehovah*.

(z) See *Allix* on the *Jewiſh* Church, p. 245.

Meribah;

Meribah; becauſe they tempted *Jehovah*, ſaying, is *Jehovah* with us or not(*a*)? But the Apoſtle *Paul* refers all this Hiſtory to Chriſt; and ſays, they did all drink of that Spiritual Rock, which followed them; [or accompanied them, ἀκολουθούσης] and that *Rock* was *Chriſt*(*b*). *Chriſt* therefore, according to St. *Paul*, was the Perſon who afforded meat and drink to our Forefathers in a miraculous manner, while they ſojourned in the Wilderneſs; and conſequently, he was the *Angel* of the *Preſence*; or the *viſible Jehovah*. "Hence it followeth, ſays Archbiſhop "*Teniſon*; that he who appeared to the People "in the Wilderneſs was the *Logos* of God(*c*)." And *Chryſoſtom* thus argues: "The Rock was "*Chriſt*: he does not ſay it was the Nature of "the Stone, but the power of God operating "in it, which opened the Fountains:—Here "he [St. Paul] entirely roots-up the Hereſy of "*Paulus Samoſatenus*: For if it was *Chriſt*, who "did all theſe things; how can it be ſaid, that "he only exiſted from the time of his Birth of "the Virgin *Mary*(*d*)?" And to the ſame purpoſe afterwards(*e*), and in numberleſs other places, he ſpeaks of Chriſt as the *Jehovah* that appeared.

(*a*) *Ex.* xvii. 6, 7. (*b*) I *Cor.* x. 4, 9. (*c*) *Teniſon* on Idolatry. p. 333. (*d*) T. v. p. 347. *Eton* edit. (*e*) p. 378.

8. We are informed by *Moſes*, that the People ſpake againſt *Jehovah*, and againſt *Moſes* at *Tſalmona*; and *Jehovah* ſent fiery Serpents among them. But St. *Paul* tells us, that *Jehovah* was *Chriſt*. For, ſpeaking of this Hiſtory, he ſays; neither let us tempt *Chriſt*, as ſome of them alalſo tempted; and were deſtroyed of Serpents(*f*).

9. St. *Paul*(*g*), conſiders the Perſon who ſpake on Mount *Sinai*; whoſe Voice then ſhook the Earth, and who is called *Jehovah*(*h*), to be the ſame perſon that is prophecied-of by *Haggai*(*i*), *i. e.* the *Meſſiah*, according to the Interpretation of the ancient *Jews*; and *Jeſus Chriſt*, according to the *Apoſtle*(*k*). See, ſays he, that ye refuſe not *him* that ſpeaketh: For if they eſcaped not, who refuſed him that ſpake on *Earth*; (*i. e.* when he gave the Law,) much more ſhall not we eſcape, if we turn away from him that ſpeaketh from *Heaven*; whoſe Voice then ſhook the Earth; but now *he* hath promiſed, ſaying; Yet once more I ſhake not the

(*f*) *Numb.* xxi. 5. xxxii. 41. *Cor.* x. 9. *Grotius* ſuppoſes a falſe reading here; and reads, according to the *Alexan.* Copy, Let us not tempt *God*. See what is ſaid in the *Unitar.* Tracts; Vol. III. Tract viii. p. 57. *Epiphanius* ſays, the Text was corrupted by *Marcion*. *Epiph.* l. 1. T. 1. p. 358. Edit. *Petav.* (*g*) *Heb.* xii. (*h*) *Ex.* xix, 18. (*i*) *Hag.* ii. 7. (*k*) *Heb.* xii. 25, 26.

Earth

Earth only, but alſo Heaven(*l*)." It is plain from the relative words in this Sentence agreeing to the ſame antecedent, as well as by the Hiſtory, that there is but *one* perſon here ſpoken-of; and that is *Chriſt*; the ſame Perſon to *whom* the Apoſtle was admoniſhing the *Hebrews* to liſten; whoſe Blood ſpeaketh better things than that of *Abel*; and conſequently, he ſuppoſes *Chriſt* to be the ſame Perſon as the *Angel* of the *Covenant*; who gave the Law from Mount *Zion*, and whoſe voice then ſhook the Earth: for, as to the voice of the ſupreme God, it was never heard at all. I ſhall only add here; that the laſt Verſe of this Chapter, "For our God is *a conſuming Fire*;" ſeems to relate to the *Angel* of the *Covenant*: of whom it is ſaid, upon the paſſage over *Jordan*: "Underſtand therefore this Day, that *Jehovah* thy God is he which goeth over before thee as a *conſuming Fire*; he ſhall deſtroy them, (the *Anakim*) and he ſhall bring them down before thy Face(*m*)."

10. The Apoſtle tells us, that it was by Chriſt that God made the Worlds (*n*): [αἰῶνας, the Ages or Diſpenſations] *i. e.* "by whom God formerly diſpoſed and ordered thoſe eminent and

(*l*) See *Aquila* in *Talmud*, parum regni dabo *Iſraelitis* poſt deſtructionem; (ſc. Templi primi) & poſt illud Regnum, ecce commovebo Cœlum & Terram; & veniet *Meſſias*. (*m*) *Deut.* ix. 3. (*n*) *Heb.* i. 2—xi. 3.

re-

remarkable periods of Time: the *Antediluvian*, the *Patriarchal*, the *Moſaic*, and the *Preſent*, being put under his Government; according to the will of the Father." Now the *Ages* or *Diſpenſations* before Chriſt, we know from our own Scriptures, were ordered by the *Angel Jehovah*: and if *He* were not the *Chriſt*, the Old and New Teſtament contradict one another; by aſcribing the *ſame* Government to two *different* Beings. St. *Paul* therefore could mean no other Perſon by *Chriſt*, than the ſame *Logos*, or *Word of God*, whom *Philo* and all of that Age underſtood to be the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, or the *Angel Jehovah*. The ſame Truth is confirmed by many other References in the Goſpels and Epiſtles; in which the Senſe is defective, upon any other Principle.

11. St. *Paul* argues from *Joel*(*nn*). It is written; [*Joel* ii. 32.] *and it ſhall come to paſs that whoſoever ſhall call on the name of the Lord*, [in the original it is *Jehovah*] ſhall be delivered: and theſe Words are quoted by St. *Paul* to prove that "whoſoever ſhall confeſs with the mouth the Lord Jeſus, and believe in his heart that God hath raiſed him from the dead, ſhall be ſaved." Now if *Chriſt* is not the *Jehovah* ſpoken-of by *Joel*, this Text is nothing to the purpoſe; as Bp. *Burnet* obſerves in his letter to Mr. *Hill*. See alſo *Whitby* ad loc.

(*nn*) Rom. x. 9.

12. Again;

12. Again; St. *Paul* tells us(*o*) that "*Moſes* eſteemed the Reproach of *Chriſt* greater Riches than the Treaſures in *Egypt*; for he had reſpect unto the recompenſe of the Reward." The *Chriſtian* Commentators are much divided, how to underſtand thoſe Words; *the Reproach of Chriſt:* and in order to explain them, have formed an Hypotheſis; that the Doctrine of *Chriſt*'s Sufferings and Death were as well known to the *Patriarchs*, as they were afterwards. Whereas if they conſidered *Chriſt* to be the viſible *Jehovah*; as St. *Paul* did, and as they themſelves are obliged to do ſometimes; the Interpretation would be plain and eaſy.—We are told of *Moſes*, that—he refuſed to be called the Son of *Pharaoh*'s Daughter; chooſing rather to ſuffer affliction with the People of *God*; (*i. e.* the People of *Jehovah*) than to enjoy the pleaſures of Sin for a Seaſon(*p*). And the beginning of the Revelation to *Moſes*, concerning their Deliverance, was; that they ſhould be called the People of *Jehovah*(*q*). And this name was caſt in their Teeth,

(*o*) *Heb.* xi. 26. (*p*) *Heb.* xi. 24.

(*q*) *Moſes* tells the *Jews*, *Jehovah* the God of the *Hebrews* is called upon us; *Gen.* iii. 18. v. 3. ſo it is rendered in both theſe places in the LXX, and alſo in *Onkelos*, and in *Jerom*'s Tranſlation: which ſhews, that they who made thoſe Tranſlations had it ſo in their Bibles. And ſo the meaning is plain, the Name *Jehovah* is called upon us; that is; *Jehovah* hath given us that Name to call ourſelves by:

Teeth as a Reproach; and looked-upon by the *Egyptians*, as the *Abomination* of the *Iſraelites*, in like manner as *Milcom* or *Aſhtaroth* were looked-upon as the *Abomination* of the *Heathens*. For the *Egyptians* conſidered the God *Jehovah*, as a God of no Power or Dominion: ſo that, when *Moſes* addreſſed himſelf to *Pharaoh* in his Name, he anſwers him with the higheſt Contempt; Who is *Jehovah*, that I ſhould obey his Voice to ſend away *Iſrael?* I know not *Jehovah*; neither will I ſend away *Iſrael*. The *reproach of Chriſt* therefore means the name of *Jehovah*: the name, which *Chriſt* then bare; and with which they were reproached, as being his People. And it is to be underſtood in the ſame ſenſe, as in the 1ſt Epiſtle of *Peter*(*r*), If ye be reproached (in or) for the Name of *Chriſt*, ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, happy are ye. So alſo, *Heb.* xiii. 13. Let us go-forth therefore unto him without the Camp, bearing his *Reproach*; which

by: and he ſaith, let my People go, that they may ſerve me. Bp. *Lloyd*, p. 24. To the ſame purpoſe, ſee *Ainſworth* on *Gen.* xlviii. 16. Let my Name be named on them; *i. e.* let them be called by my Name, as my adopted Children; ver. 5. So God's Name is ſaid to be called on us; *Deut.* xxviii. 10—II *Chron.* vii. 14—*Jer.* xiv. 9. as the Huſband's Name is called upon the Wife; *Iſ.* iv. 1. and the Lord's Name upon *Jeruſalem*. *Dan.* xix. 19. and upon the Temple. I *Kings* viii. 43—*Jer.* vii. 10, 11.

(*r*) *Peter* iv. 4.

Grotius

Grotius explains, the Reproach which they bare for his Name's ſake(*s*). And ſo *the Sufferings of Chriſt*, ſignify the Sufferings which the Apoſtles bare for the ſake of *Chriſt* (*t*): for as the Sufferings of *Chriſt* abound in us, ſo our Conſolation alſo aboundeth by *Chriſt*. "If any Man ſuffer as a *Chriſtian* ſays the Apoſtle *Peter*; let him not be aſhamed(*u*)." Now, if theſe learned Men are right, the Reproach of *Chriſt*, may mean the Reproach which *Moſes* ſuffered for his Name; becauſe he choſe to be numbered among the People of *Jehovah*, rather than be called the Son of *Pharaoh*'s daughter, and an *Egyptian*. The *Egyptians* reproached and afflicted the *Iſraelites*; becauſe they worſhipped *Jehovah*, and were called by his Name; but *Moſes* eſteemed that Reproach more than all the Treaſures in *Egypt*: for he had reſpect to the Reward which he expected to receive from *Jehovah*, who ſent him; and whom St. *Paul* conſiders, in his future Character of the *Chriſt*: and it could not be called the Reproach of *Chriſt*, in any other ſenſe.

13. We are told by *Peter*; that *Chriſt* ſuffered —being put to death in the *Fleſh*, but quickened by the *Spirit*; by which alſo He went and preached unto the Spirits in Priſon, which ſometime were diſobedient, when once the long-ſuf-

(*s*) *Mat.* v. 11. (*t*) II *Cor.* i. 5. (*u*) I *Peter*, iv. 26.

fering of God waited in the days of *Noah:* while the Ark was preparing(*x*).

Now whatever be mean'd by the *Spirits in Priſon*; it is plain that the Apoſtle is ſpeaking of Chriſt's preaching to *Men*, in the days of *Noah*; which is enough for my purpoſe here. And thence I argue; that, if Chriſt be not the viſible *Jehovah*; we are at a loſs what this Hiſtory can relate-to; but if they be *One* and the *ſame Perſon*, under different Names; the words of the Apoſtle agree with the Hiſtory of thoſe times, as given us by *Moſes* (*y*): "And *Jehovah* ſaid, my Spirit ſhall not always ſtrive with Man; for that he alſo is Fleſh: yet his days ſhall be a hundred and twenty years(*z*)." This was the time of *Jehovah*'s Forbearance and long-ſuffering, while the Ark was in building: during which time his Spirit continued to preach to thoſe diſobedient Spirits, by *Noah*; whom he inſpired to foretell their deſtruction, if they did not repent within that ſpace of time(*a*).

14. The *Chriſtians* univerſally allow the *Adon* or *Lord*, of whom the Prophet *Malachi* declares that he ſhall ſuddenly come to his Temple; to be the *Chriſt:* and the Apoſtles quote the Text to that purpoſe. But how can it be called *His* Temple, if *He* be not the viſible *Jehovah?* The Temple ſucceeded in the place of the Ta-

(*x*) I *Pet.* iii. 18, 19, 20. (*y*) *Gen.* vi. 3. (*z*) ver. 18. (*a*) ver. 13.

bernacle;

bernacle; and the Tabernacle was built for the reſidence of *Jehovah* between the Cherubim; and the Temple was built for the *Name* of *Jehovah*; *i. e.* the ſame Perſon: and he continued to appear upon the Mercy-Seat, after it was placed in the Temple; and the Temple was *Jehovah*'s Temple(*b*). How then can it be ſaid to be the *Meſſiah*'s Temple; if he be not *Jehovah*(*c*)? *Vatablus* indeed tells us, that *Jehovah*'s Temple is here called the Temple of *Chriſt*: and ſo we are told by *Calvin* (*d*); that *Chriſt* ſpeaks not as a Man or an *Angel*, but as *Jehovah*; by which name he is there called: and in numberleſs Places of the *Critici Sacri*, the *Chriſtian* Commentators tell us, that by *Jehovah*, who appears and ſpeaks, is mean'd *Chriſt*. But why then do they not univerſally allow it through the whole Bible, whenever the viſible *Jehovah* is ſpoken-of? If Chriſt be not the viſible *Jehovah*, why do they not *deny it every where?* and if he be, why do they not *own it every where?* If he be ſo *at all*, he muſt be ſo always.

15. As the Temple of *Jehovah* is called the Temple of Chriſt, in the New Teſtament; ſo the People of *Jehovah* are called the People of *Chriſt*; or his *own*: which they could not be,

(*b*) II *Kings* viii. (*c*) The *Jews* maintain, that the *Shechinah* and the *Logos* are the ſame; and that the Temple was dedicated to *God* and to his *Shechinah*. *Allix*, 329. (*d*) on *Zech.* ii. 10.

if *Chriſt* was not ſuppoſed to be *Jehovah*.—Nothing can be more clearly revealed, than the Peculiarity of *Our* Nation. "When the moſt High divided to the Nations their inheritance, when he ſeparated the Sons of *Adam*, he ſet the bounds of the People, according to the number of the Children of *Iſrael*: (or, as the LXX read it, according to the number of the *Angels* of *God*.) For *Jehovah*'s portion is his People; *Jacob* is the Lot of his Inheritance (*e*). He choſe them to be a ſpecial People to himſelf, above all the People who were upon the Face of the Earth; though all the Earth were his (*f*): to be a People of Inheritance (*g*); a peculiar Treaſure to him (*h*): and therefore *Iſaiah* ſays; "We are *Thine*; *Thou* never beareſt rule over *Them*; (the Heathen; but how can this be ſaid of the ſupreme God?) *They* never were called by *Thy* Name." And therefore, when the Evangeliſt St. *John*, ſpeaking of the *Word* of *God*, ſays; "He came into the World, and the World knew him not; he came unto his own, and his own received him not (*i*):" nothing ever appeared more plain to me, than that the Words *His Own*, related to this Peculiarity; and the Evangeliſt was conſidering him as King of the *Jews*, our Lord and King of old.

(*e*) *Deut.* xxxii. 8, 9. (*f*) *Deut.* vii. 6. xiv. 2. xxvi. 18. (*g*) *Deut.* iv. 20. (*h*) *Ex.* xix. 5. (*i*) *John* i. 10, 11.

Ἐγγὺς

Ἐγγὺς ἦν ἰδίων, ἴδιοι δὲ μὲν ἄφρονι λύσσῃ
Ὡς ξένον οὐκ ἀγίραιον. *Nonn.*

Prope erat proprios; ſui vero cum imprudenti rabie ut peregrinum eum non honorabant.

But if Chriſt were not the *Jehovah*, whoſe People and Subjects *We* are in a particular manner, more than the reſt of the World; we can neither be called *his own*; nor had he any kind of Connection with our Nation, till after he was born into this world.

16. And this interpretation is confirmed, by a very remarkable reference to the *ſame Truth* by St. *Paul*; who ſays, ſpeaking of Chriſt's Exaltation; "Thy Throne, O God, is forever and ever; a Sceptre of Righteouſneſs is the Sceptre of thy Kingdom: Thou haſt loved Righteouſneſs, and hated Iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the Oil of Gladneſs, above thy Fellows(*k*)." Theſe words are quoted from *Pſ.* xlv. 6, 7. and applied to *Chriſt:* and the reaſon here given of *Chriſt's* Exaltation above his fellows, is; becauſe he loved Righteouſneſs, and hated Iniquity; and the Sceptre of his *Kingdom* was a righteous Sceptre. But where was the Righteouſneſs of this *Kingly* Government manifeſted? He declared himſelf to be the *King* of the *Jews*; his Diſciples owned him as ſuch; and he had,

(*k*) *Heb.* i. 8, 9.

in

in the Character of the *Jehovah Angel*, exercised the *regal* Power for many Ages; and had been celebrated under that Title by the *Jewish* Prophets(*l*): Why then do the *Christians* exclude all these Considerations from the Apostle's meaning in this Text; and confine the Righteousness of his Sceptre to his behaviour under the Character of the *Son* of *Man*? When, on the one hand, if he be not considered as the *Jehovah Angel*; it does not appear how he could be called the *King* of the *Jews*, in any sense at all; for he was a Stranger to them and to their Fathers: And, on the other hand, in the Character of the *Son of Man*, he had exercised *no Kingly* Office.—His righteous Government, as a *King*, seems to be here mentioned; as a chief instance of his Love of Righteousness, for which he was exalted; (after having manifested the highest instance of it, by his Death:) and it seems therefore much more probable to relate to his pass'd conduct and *kingly* Government over our Nation, in the Character of the *Jehovah Angel*; than to any thing future: as all his acts of *regal* Government over the *Christians*, were to be. St. *Paul* goes so far back to shew his power, [ver. 10.] as to instance his first laying the foundations of the Earth, and forming the Heavens; which were the actions of the *Jehovah Angel*. And his Righteousness

(*l*) See *Pierce* on *Heb.* i. 9.

was

was no leſs conſpicuous; when acting in the name of God he ſhewed his Love of Righteouſneſs, and hatred of Iniquity, through the whole *Jewiſh* Diſpenſation. For though he was afflicted in all their afflictions, and was grieved for the miſery of *Iſrael*; yet when they rebelled, and vexed his holy Spirit; he turned to be their Enemy, and fought againſt them(*m*). Whether this be the moſt natural ſenſe to a *Chriſtian*, I do not pretend to judge: but it muſt appear in a very ſtrong and ſtriking Light, to every one that conſiders *Chriſt* as the *Angel*, by whom God governed our Fathers; and who is ſo often celebrated by *David*, as our *Lord* and *King of old*.

17. This Doctrine is moſt fully confirmed, by the Lamentation of *Chriſt* over our unhappy City: wherein he not only ſpeaks of himſelf as the *Jehovah Angel*, who was *return'd* to dwell among us, according to his promiſe(*n*); but as the Perſon, who had *preſided* over them in *former days*; and would *again return* and *ſave* them, in the *latter* days; before the End of the World. The two Evangeliſts, *Matthew* and *Luke*, inform us; that *Chriſt* beheld the City of *Jeruſalem*, and brake-forth into this pathetic and compaſſionate Lamentation: "O "*Jeruſalem, Jeruſalem*; which killeſt the Pro- "phets, and ſtoneſt them that are ſent unto

(*m*) *Iſ.* lxiii. 9, 10. (*n*) *Zech.* ii. 10, &c.

"thee;

" thee; *how often* would I have gathered thy " Children together, as a Hen doth gather her " Brood under her Wings; and ye would not? " behold, your houſe is left unto you deſolate: " and verily I ſay unto you, ye ſhall not ſee me " henceforth; till ye ſhall ſay, Bleſſed is he " that cometh in the name of the Lord(*o*)." And again, the Evangeliſt *Luke* tells us(*p*); that, when *Jeſus* was come near, (to *Jeruſalem,*) he beheld the City and wept over it; ſaying, " If thou hadſt known, even thou, at leaſt in " this thy day, the things which belong unto " thy peace; but now they are hid from thine " Eyes. For the days ſhall come upon thee, " that thine enemies ſhall caſt a trench about " thee, and compaſs thee round, and keep " thee in on every ſide, and ſhall lay thee even " with the ground, and thy Children within " thee;—and they ſhall not leave in thee one " Stone upon another: becauſe thou kneweſt " not the *time of thy Viſitation.*"

In theſe Words there are ſeveral very remarkable References to the Hiſtory and Character of the *Jehovah Angel*; which are appropriated to *Chriſt*, by himſelf.

Firſt, he ſays; " how *often* would I have " gathered thy Children together, as a Hen " doth gather her Brood under her Wings;

(*o*) *Luke* xiii. 34. *Mat.* xxiii, 37, 38, 39. (*p*) *Luke* xix. 41, 42, 43, 44.

" and

"and ye would not!" Now in what Hiſtory do we find this, or any other Account of the *Meſſiah's* Care and Superintendence over the Children of *Iſrael*, before he was incarnate? No where. We are indeed informed(*q*); that the *Jehovah Angel* found him in a deſart Land, and in the waſte howling Wilderneſs; and He led him about, He inſtructed him, He kept him as the apple of his Eye—So *Jehovah alone* did lead him; there was no ſtrange God with him, ver. 12. but we do not find a word of *Chriſt* in this Account, if he be not the *ſame Jehovah*; nay, he is excluded by the very words of *Moſes:* for *Jehovah alone* did lead him.

Dr. *Hammond* and moſt of the *Chriſtian* Commentators explain this *gathering* of the Children together to mean Chriſt's paſſionate invitations of men to become his Proſelytes: but it ſeems much more natural and agreeable to the Senſe of the Words, to refer it to the former days; when he ſent his Prophets among them. For the *ſending the Prophets* and the *gathering the Children* are ſo plainly connected; that the Words can be no otherwiſe interpreted, than as follows. How *often* would I, even in *former* ages, have *gathered* your Children together into Safety; and to that purpoſe *ſent* my Prophets among you; but you would not be *gathered:*

(*q*) *Deut.* xxxi. 10.

on the contrary you *killed my Prophets*, and ſtoned them that I ſent unto you; and would not receive my Inſtructions. This is the plain Senſe of the Words; in which Chriſt declares, that it was *He* who had ſent the prophets among them; and conſequently He was the ſame *Jehovah*, who had taken our Nation under his Protection, as the Lot of his Inheritance. On the contrary, we never hear that the *Meſſiah* ever *ſent* or ever *was to ſend* any prophet among them; they were all ſent by *Jehovah*. And though it may be always proper to underſtand what is ſaid by an Angel or a Prophet, to be ſpoken by *Jehovah* himſelf; becauſe he ſends them, and they ſpeak in his name, and as his Meſſengers: yet, it can never be ſaid, that what is ſpoken by an Angel, or a Prophet, was ſpoken by *Chriſt*; if he was not the Viſible *Jehovah:* nor can they be ſaid to be ſent *by him*. For they neither ſpake in *his* Name; nor *did he ſend* them.

But 2dly, *Chriſt* in this Lamentation declares to the *Jews*, that deſtruction would unavoidably happen to them; becauſe they knew not the *time* of their *Viſitation*(r). He had more than once expreſſed to *Moſes*, in the Character of *Jehovah*, the moſt earneſt deſires; that our Nation would be *wiſe*, and conſider it's *latter end*; which would be happy or un-

(r) *Deut.* v. 29. xxxii. 29, 30.

happy,

happy, according to it's behaviour: and had ſent his Prophets to inſtruct them, and prevent their Ruin: but they not ſucceeding, the laſt and moſt extraordinary effort he made to the ſame purpoſe was by coming among them *himſelf*, and *gathering* them in his *own perſon*; of which he gave them Warning by his Prophets, that they might be ready to receive him. But ſo negligent were they even of theſe prophecies, and every thing that belonged to their peace and ſafety; that, when the viſible *Jehovah* returned to viſit them, according to his promiſe; to give them a new Covenant, and be *their* God(*s*), and they ſhould be *his* people; they *would not receive* this Covenant, nor *acknowledge* him, nor *be joined* to him; And therefore their houſe was left unto them deſolate; "becauſe they knew not the time of "their Viſitation" [τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, id eſt, hoc temporis punctum quo Deus ipſe inviſit(*t*).] In all this we ſee, that this *Viſitation* of *Chriſt* was the ſame which is foretold by *Ezekiel* to be performed by *Jehovah*, who brought our fathers out of *Egypt*; and conſequently, by the *Jehovah Angel*. In the 3d place, *Chriſt* declares to our Nation; that they ſhould ſee him no more, till they ſhould ſay; Bleſſed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord(*u*): that is, till they ſhould confeſs him to be the *Meſſiah*; [ὁ ἐρχόμενος]

(*s*) *Ezek.* xxxi. 31. (*t*) *Beza.* (*u*) *Matt.* xxiii.

which they ſhould do, at his ſecond Coming. But where do we find in our prophecies, that the *Meſſiah* will appear twice? this was a *Myſtery*, i. e. not clearly revealed, to *Us*; and the ignorance of it led us into great Errors; which we ſhould have been free from, if we had conſidered him as the *Angel Jehovah*. For the Salvation in the latter days was foretold to be by the *Jehovah, who brought us out of Egypt*. And *Joel* ii. 32, ſays, Whoſoever ſhall call on the name of *Jehovah*, ſhall be delivered; for in Mount *Zion* and in *Jeruſalem* ſhall be deliverance: and *Zech.* ii. 12. for *Jehovah* ſhall inherit *Judah*, his Portion in the holy land; and ſhall chooſe *Jeruſalem again:* and *Moſes* ſays, [*Deut.* iv. 30.] even in the *latter days*, if we return unto *Jehovah* and obey his voice, he will not forſake nor deſtroy us; nor forſake his Covenant made unto our Fathers. Now this Text of *Joel* is quoted both by *Peter* and *Paul*, which declares Salvation to all that call on *Jehovah:* and *Paul* goes farther, and tells us; all *Iſrael* ſhall be ſaved, if they continue not in unbelief; when the *Deliverer* ſhall come out of *Zion*(*x*). But the *Deliverer out of Zion* is the *Jehovah* of *Zion:* and the not continuing in unbelief is the confeſſing *Chriſt* to be ὁ ἐρχόμενος, the *King* that cometh in the name of the Lord(*y*). From all which it plainly appears, that *Chriſt*

(*x*) *Ro.* xi. 26. (*y*) *Iſ.* xxv. 8, 9.

diſcovers

diſcovers himſelf to be the perſon who ſent the Prophets; i. e. the *Jehovah Angel:* the *Jehovah* who was to *viſit* us and bring in a new Covenant, prophecied-of by *Jer.* xxxi. 31, &c. that is, the *Meſſiah* and the *Saviour* at the *Latter* days, *that cometh in the Name of the Lord*; or the *Jehovah* of *Zion*. So that, according to *Chriſt* himſelf, he was the Superintendent over us from the beginning; and will continue to be ſo till the End of all things.

And from theſe Obſervations upon the words of the Scripture theſe two Truths appear to me extremely evident.

Firſt, that *Jeſus* and his Diſciples *knew him* to be the *Angel-Jehovah*; and *revealed it ſufficiently* to all ſuch as would examine, and honeſtly attend-to what they ſaid upon the Subject; and to thoſe who would not, "the things which "pertained to their peace were hidden from "their eyes."

Secondly, it appears; that Almighty God has from the beginning carried on the Government of the World, by the Miniſtration of *one* and the *ſame* Perſon; who hath appeared under *different appellations*, according to the *different diſpenſations* in which he was employed; and the *different Characters* he bare. And this is the ſame perſon, who choſe *Judah* for his Inheritance; and hath from the days of *Abraham* been more particularly engaged, by himſelf or his Angels,

Angels, in the Care and Protection of *our* Nation; and even in the latter days will continue to be ſo, till he hath performed the promiſe; that in *Abraham's Seed* ſhall all the families of the Earth be bleſſed: And the Completion of this Prophecy conſtitutes the Chriſtian Religion.

I ſhall end this Letter, with five Rules to direct us, when we are certainly to underſtand the Word *God* or *Jehovah* in the *Old Teſtament* to ſignify the *Jehovah Angel*, or *Angel* of the *Covenant*.

1. Whenever we read of God *coming from* God, *ſent* and *commiſſioned* by him, *receiving authority and Power from* him; *upheld* and *ſtrengthened by* him in his office and work: in all ſuch *paſſages* the *Lord* there ſpoken-of is plainly intended to be the *Son of God* coming from the *Father*.

2. When we read of God *viſibly* appearing unto men in perſon, *preſent* with them, *coming to judge the Earth*; (i. e. to *inſtruct* men by his Doctrine,) *giving-out his Laws* and *Ordinances*, *ſetting-up* a *new* Kingdom and Government over them by his Authority; *this Lord* is the *Son* of God, at whoſe preſence the Earth is ſaid to tremble, and the hills to melt like wax; to ſignify *his* Majeſty, who ſhould command all Nature; and whom all Men ſhould reverence and fear.

3. When

3. When we read of God, whom *Sion* and *Judah* ſhould *behold*, and rejoice at his *coming* and *preſence*, and be glad becauſe of his Laws; ſuch paſſages can be applied to none but the *Son* of God; and thoſe who waited for Redemption and Conſolation in *Iſrael:* when he ſhould *viſit* them according to his *promiſe*, and *make* a *new Covenant* with them; *Jer.* xxxi. 31. &c. and therefore it was truly prophecied of him (*z*); *Zion* heareth, and is glad; the daughters of *Jeruſalem* rejoice, becauſe of thy judgments, O God.

4. God *calling* the Nations of the World and the Multitude of the Iſles to the Knowledge of himſelf, to be *his people* in covenant with him, is and can be *no other* than *Chriſt*. For many ages He was *known only* in *Sion*, his *name* was *great* in *Judah*, he *ruled* in *Iſrael*, as their *Lord* and *King*; whilſt all other Nations and People lived as without God in the World. But the moſt ancient prophecies foretold, that it ſhould not be always ſo: But to *Him* all the Nations of the Earth ſhould be gathered; and the utmoſt ends of the Earth be *his* poſſeſſion(*a*). Therefore when it is ſaid, "*Jehovah reigneth* (*b*); let the Earth rejoice, and the Multitude of the Iſles be glad at the *preſence* of the *Lord of the whole Earth* (*c*); the Heavens ſhall declare his Righ-

(*z*) *Pſ.* xcvii. 8. (*a*) *Jer.* iii. 7. (*b*) *Pſ.* ii. 8. (*c*) *Pſ.* xcvii. 1. 6.

teouſneſs,

teouſneſs, and all the people *ſee his Glory*;" this can be underſtood of *no other* but the *Son* of God *coming* in his Kingdom.

5. When we read of God's *Enemies* riſing up againſt him, and his *conſuming* them by the moſt terrible Vengeance, and with fiery indignation and wrath; ſuch things are to be underſtood of the *Son* of God *incarnate*, whom his wicked Enemies did hate and perſecute with all manner of Indignity and rage; and of *His* deſtruction of them. God the *Father* never *was*, nor *could be* expoſed to ſuffer by the Violence and Fury of men; his enemies and adverſaries *never could* afflict and wound *him*; but only in the *perſon* of his *Son*. And never did God avenge innocent blood ſhed by wicked hands, with more exemplary Vengeance on his Enemies; than in the Deſtruction of the *Jewiſh* Nation, already paſſed (*d*): or will in a more dreadful Deſtruction revenge himſelf in their *defence* hereafter, when their enemies ſhall be *gathered together* againſt them in the latter days. Of which dreadful Slaughter we read, *Ezek.* xxxviii, xxxix (*e*): where it is deſcribed as a great Sacrifice: and in the Revelation of St. *John* it is deſcribed as the *Supper* of the great God, xix. 17. and the *Gathering* of his *Vintage*, xiv. 18. and the *Battle* of

(*d*) *Moſes*'s Song. *Ex.* xv. *If.* xlii. 25. (*e*) *If.* lxvi 15, 16.

the

the great day; xvi. 14. All these things therefore relate to the Reign of *Messiah* the *Prince*, and his Conquests over his Enemies; before the Kingdoms of the Earth shall become the Kingdoms of the *Lord*, and of his CHRIST.

POSTSCRIPT

TO

THE SECOND LETTER.

THE Opinion, which aſcribeth to the *Logos* or *Word*, the delivery of the Law; is objected-to by the learned *Grotius*, as a grievous Error; in his Notes on the Decalogue: and he offers two Reaſons; which are anſwered by Archbiſhop *Teniſon*, in his diſcourſe of Idolatry: P. 333.

The 1ſt Objection is founded on *Heb.* i. 1. "God, who at ſundry times, and in diverſe manners, ſpake in time paſt unto the Fathers by the *Prophets*; hath, in theſe laſt Days, ſpoken unto Us by his *Son*"——From hence it is argued; that God did not ſpeak to us, by his *Son*, before the laſt Days.

Now

Now the plain obvious ſenſe of theſe Words appears to me to be this: God formerly ſpake to our Fathers, [*i. e.* to the *Jewiſh* Nation] by the mediation or miniſtration of the *Prophets*; but now ſpeaks to Us, *by the Son himſelf*; without any ſuch mediation.

The hiſtorical Truth, upon which the Apoſtle founds his Argument, is this; that God uſed in times paſt to ſpeak to the Fathers, by the mediation of *Moſes*, or other Prophets; but in the time of the *Chriſtian* Oeconomy he ſpake to us by *Chriſt* in Perſon.

The queſtion is not, how God revealed himſelf to the *Prophets*; but how he revealed himſelf to the *Fathers*. And we know, he revealed himſelf to the *Fathers*, by the *Prophets*; who were of like ſtation and quality with themſelves. "Revera enim erat *Dominus* per *Moſem* Pædagogus veteris Populi; per *Seipſum* autem novi Dux, facie ad faciem (*a*)." The *Lord* was the Inſtructer of the ancient People, by *Moſes*; but the Leader of the new People by *Himſelf*, face to face: and from hence the Apoſtle juſtly concludes, that we ought to give greater heed to what is ſaid by *Chriſt himſelf*, who is the *Son of God*; than to what is ſaid by the *Prophets*: becauſe he is *ſuperior* to them.

The Apoſtle here uſes the ſame Argument, which is made uſe of by *Chriſt*, in his Parable of

(*a*) Clem. Pæd. l. I. c. vii. p. 110, 111.

the Vineyard; where the Lord of the Vineyard, after having in vain ſent ſeveral *Meſſengers* to the Huſbandmen who occupied it, that he might receive the fruits of it; did at laſt ſend his *Son:* ſaying, They will reverence my *Son*(*b*). The Authority of *God* was certainly the *ſame*; whether revealed by Prophets, or Angels, or a Being ſuperior to Angels: but yet the *ſuperiority* of Character in the Perſon employed in the Meſſage, ſhews manifeſtly the *greater Regard* that is expected to be paid to the Embaſſy; and the greater Importance of it. And all the Apoſtle's Arguments in this Chapter are founded upon this one *Principle*; and concluſive upon this one *Poſtulatum.* But it does by no means follow; when the Apoſtle ſays, God ſpake to us by *Prophets*; that he did not ſpeak to us by his *Son:* (or by the *Jehovah Angel*, who inſpired the *Prophets:*) becauſe the Apoſtle's Argument regarded only the *immediate* Revealer of God's will; and not the Perſon, by whom the Prophets (who were the *immediate* Revealers of his will to us) were inſpired.

We know for certain; that *God* ſpake to *Moſes*, by the *Angel* of the *Covenant.* But if this Argument of *Grotius* proves, that Chriſt did not ſpeak to the Fathers; becauſe *God* ſpake to them by the *Prophets*: it will alſo prove, that the *Angel* of the *Covenant* did not ſpeak to the

(*b*) *Mat.* xxii. 37.

Fathers;

Fathers; becauſe God ſpake to them by the *Prophets*. If it exclude *Chriſt*; it will alſo exclude the *Angel* of the *Covenant*: but it does not exclude the *latter*; and therefore not the former. And conſequently, they may be both the *ſame* Perſon; for any thing that appears to the contrary, from this Text.

The Apoſtle goes-on upon the ſame Principle to a ſecond Argument; *viz.* That we ought to give more *earneſt heed* to the *Goſpel*, than to the *Law*: becauſe the *Law* was given by *Angels*; but the *Goſpel* by the *Lord*, who was *ſuperior* to *Angels*. And from hence ariſes *Grotius'* ſecond Argument; to prove, that the Law and the *Goſpel* were not given by the ſame Perſon: becauſe the *Law* was given by *Angels*; *i. e.* as *Grotius* explains it, by the Angel ſuſtaining the Perſon of God, and many more ſuch ſpirits making that glorious train; but the *Goſpel* by the *Lord Jeſus*, the Son of God(*c*).

And, this being the true State of the Caſe; it was neceſſary for the Apoſtle, in order to make good his Argument, to prove; that the *Lord*, who delivered the *Goſpel*; was ſuperior to the *Angel*, who gave the *Law*: which he accordingly does. But how does he undertake this proof? Not by ſhewing, that the *Lord*, who gave the *Goſpel*, was a different perſon from the *Angel*,

(*c*) *Tenison* of Idolatry; p. 333.

who

who gave the *Law*; or ſuperior to him, in his *metaphyſical nature*; Nor by ſhewing, that he was *always* ſuperior to him in Power, and Glory, and Character; which would have been the moſt *obvious* and *natural* arguments, if true: but he makes uſe of the very ſame Arguments, as if the Lord, who gave the *Goſpel*, had been that very *Angel*, who gave the *Law*; and who was afterwards exalted to a higher Station and Character.

For the Apoſtle expreſſes the Character of the *Lord*, who delivered the *Goſpel*, in ſuch Terms; as particularly denote and characterize him to have been formerly the Angel of the Covenant. He calls him the *Son* of God; *by whom* God made the *Worlds*, or *Ages*(*d*); The brightneſs of his Glory, and the expreſs image of his Perſon: [*Heb.* i. 1.] which expreſſions plainly refer us to the account which *Moſes* gives us of the *Jehovah Angel*, who appeared [ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ] in the *Form* of God, and is called the *Face* of God; [εἶδος Θεοῦ] and the *Similitude* of God(*e*): and all

(*d*) Τὰς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν, appointed the former Diſpenſations. See *Pyle*, on *Acts* ii. 26. Ἐποίησε, that is, Κατέστησεν, ſays *Chryſoſtom*; hath *appointed*. Thus our Saviour ἐποίησε δώδεκα, *made* twelve; *i. e. ordained*; as we rightly render it. And the LXX, *Gen.* xli. 34. Let *Pharaoh* make or appoint Officers; agreeably to the *Hebrew*, עשה. Now God *appointed* the former Diſpenſations by the *Angel* of the *Covenant*.

(*e*) *Num.* xii. 8.

theſe

theſe Expreſſions were underſtood by the Jews of that age to be deſcriptive of the *Angel* who gave the Law; and of no other Perſon.

It was neceſſary therefore for the Apoſtle, in order to complete his Argument; which concludes, that *greater* heed ſhould be given to the *Goſpel*, than to the *Law*; to ſhew, that the *Lord*, who delivered the *Goſpel*, was now *become ſuperior* in *Character* to the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, who gave the *Law*; and accordingly he tells us, that he was anointed with the Oil of Gladneſs, above his Fellows; [*i. e.* above the Angels(*f*):] and it was, becauſe he loved Righteouſneſs, and hated Iniquity; that he was made or conſtituted the Heir of all things,

(*f*) Mr. *Pierce* obſerves; that "μέτοχοι, Fellows, or "Partners, muſt here mean the Angels; or elſe the ci-"tation is nothing at all to the Author's purpoſe; "which is, to ſhew his Superiority to the Angels. The "reaſon why the Angels are called his *Fellows*, or *Part-*"*ners*, muſt be fetched from what they were *before*, and "not what they were *after*, his being *anointed* or inau-"gurated. After his being anointed, they were no "longer his *Fellows*, but his *Subjects*; but, before it, "they were *Partners* or *Sharers* with him; in his Go-"vernment of the World: They preſiding over their "reſpective Provinces, as He did over *Iſrael*. He was "anointed with the Oil of Gladneſs, *above* or *more than* "his Fellows; becauſe *He* received ſuch an Authority, "Dominion, or Kingdom, as was never conferred upon "any one of *Them*; *He* being then made Prince, not of "a ſmall Province, but of the whole World." *Pierce* on *Heb.* i. 9.

in

in the laſt days; (for I underſtand the words *in the laſt days*, to relate to his being *made Heir* of all things, as well as to our being ſpoken to by him:) and that it was by *Inheritance*, (or by his being made Son and Heir of all things) when he came into this World in the Fleſh(g), that

(g) "That the ſame Perſon, who had been in the "form of God, as being the *Shechinah*, or viſible repre-"ſentation of God's inviſible Glory, and the declarer "and executer of his will, under the Old Teſtament; "did receive that dominion and power of Judgement, "with which he is now inveſted; and was made *Heir* "and *Judge* of all, after his Reſurrection from the "Dead; is clearly declared by St. *Paul*; who tells us, "[*Philip.* ii. 6, 7, 8, 9.] that being in the *form of* "*God*, [οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο] *he did not claim to be* [ho-"noured] *as God*; [ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε] *but emptied himſelf* "[of that glorious *Form*] &c. *wherefore God hath highly* "*exalted him, and given him a Name*, &c. Exalted "*whom?* was it not plainly *that Perſon*, who had been "in the *Form of God?*——To the ſame purpoſe the "Apoſtle again; *God hath in theſe laſt days ſpoken to us by* "*his Son*; *whom he hath appointed Heir of all things, by* "*whom alſo he made the Worlds*: [αἰῶνας] *Heb.* i. 2. "Here moſt evidently the ſame Perſon, and no other, "*by whom* God made the Worlds, is the *Perſon* whom he "hath Now appointed *Heir* of all things; [verſe 3.] "*Who being the brightneſs of his Glory, and the expreſs* "*image of his Perſon*; WHEN *he had of himſelf purged our* "*Sins, ſat down on the right-hand of the Majeſty on High*: "THEN it was, that God ſaid unto him; *Thou art my* "*Son, this day have I begotten Thee*: [verſe 5.] THEN it "was, that God commanded, ſaying; *Let all the Angels* "*of God worſhip him*: [verſe 6.] THEN it was, that he "ſaid

that he obtained a more excellent Name than they. And having thus cleared his Argument from this obvious Objection; (*viz.* that *Chriſt* was ſuperior to the Angel that gave the Law) not by denying the Fact, but by ſhewing that he was now *exalted* to a *higher Character*, viz. to be *Lord and Heir of all things*; he proceeds without farther obſtruction to conclude, that the Dignity of his Perſon, as *Meſſiah* and *Son* of *God*, being ſuperior to his Dignity and Character, as *Angel* of the *Covenant*; therefore we ought to give greater heed, &c. Chap. ii. 1.

And therefore I anſwer; It is true, that the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, who gave the *Law*; was *inferior* to *Chriſt*, who gave the *Goſpel:* and yet he was the *ſame Being*. For the Apoſtle makes no compariſon here between different *metaphyſical Natures*; but between the different *Stations* and *Characters* of the *ſame* Being, at different *Times*; and between receiving a doctrine, from the Meſſenger or Angel of God; and from the Lord *himſelf*, whoſe Servants we are; under *both* which Characters the Apoſtle had juſt conſidered him:—1ſt, as an Angel; and 2dly, as

" ſaid *unto the Son*; *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and* " *ever—Thou haſt loved Righteouſneſs—therefore God, even* " *thy God, hath anointed thee:* [ver. 8, 9.] THEN it was, " that *all Power* was *given unto him*; *in Heaven and Earth:* " [*Mat.* xxviii. 18,] and that *All things were put under* " *his Feet.* [*Eph.* i. 22."]——The Quotation goes-on, p. 84. Reply to Dr. Waterland's Defence, 233.

one who had obtained a more excellent name. And the Reaſon the Apoſtle labours ſo much to ſhew the difference in their *Characters*, is; becauſe there was no difference in their *Perſons*: But the ſame Perſon, who is ſpoken-of as an *Angel*, under the *Old Teſtament*; is ſpoken-of as *Meſſiah* the *Prince*(*h*), in the *New*: when he was made both Lord and Chriſt, a Prince and a Saviour(*i*); and had all things given into his hand(*k*). And the Apoſtle's Argument is equally concluſive; whether he argues, that we ought to give the more earneſt heed to the things which we have heard; becauſe they are revealed by a *different* Being, of a ſuperior Character; or, becauſe they are revealed by the *ſame* Being, after being exalted to a ſuperior Character.

Archbiſhop *Teniſon* ſays; " God *formerly* " ſpake by his Son, as the *Logos*, or Miniſter; " and in the *latter* times by him, as his *Son* in- " carnate; or begotten by the holy Ghoſt of " the Subſtance of the Virgin *Mary*.—The " *Word* was God's Miniſter, before and under " the *Law*; but not in the ſame *Quality*, as " under the *Goſpel*: and he conſiders it as pro- " per to diſtinguiſh between *Chriſt*, as God's " *Word* and *Shechinah*, under the *former* Cove- " nants; and as *Mediator* and God's *Son*,

(*h*) *Dan.* ix. 25. (*i*) *Acts* v. 31. (*k*) *John* iii. 35.

" under

" under the *Goſpel:*" And for the ſame opinion he quotes *Le Blanc's* Theological *Theſes*; who owneth Chriſt as the *Miniſter* of *God*, of Old; but not as *Mediator*. He was *then* the *Angel* of the *Covenant*; but when he came into the World, in the Character of the Son of Man, he was made both *Lord* and *Chriſt*(*l*).

An Argument, like to theſe which we are conſidering, is uſed by the ſame Author; [*Heb.* xii. 25.] " See that ye refuſe not him that ſpeaketh; for if *they* eſcaped not, who refuſed him that ſpake on *Earth*; much more ſhall not *we* eſcape, if we turn-away from him that ſpeaketh from *Heaven*." Here the Apoſtle draws the ſame Concluſion from ſuperiority of *Place*, which the ſame Perſon ſpeaks from; as he did before from ſuperiority of *Dignity*, which the ſame Perſon was exalted to. For He who ſpake on the *Earth*, is the ſame Perſon, as He who ſpake from *Heaven*; and He who ſhook the *Earth*, [ver. 26.] the ſame as He who ſhook the *Heavens*. And the Argument is as concluſive, as if they were different Perſons. " See that ye refuſe not him that [now] ſpeaketh; [*viz.* the Son of God:] for if *they* eſcaped not, who refuſed [to hear] him that ſpake *on Earth*; [when he gave the Law, and ſpake but as an *Angel* and Meſſenger of the Father;] much more ſhall not *we* eſcape, if we

(*l*) *Acts* ii. 36.

turn away from him that [now] ſpeaketh from *Heaven:* [being now become the *Son* and *Heir*, and *Lord*, of all things; ſeated on the right-hand of God in the Heavens, and ſpeaking and acting with an Authority of his *own*.]

The Apoſtle goes-on, [*Heb.* ii. 5.] to lay down another Reaſon, why we ought to give more earneſt heed to the Words ſpoken by the Lord; becauſe we are under *His immediate* Government: whereas, under the *Jewiſh* Diſpenſation, the Government of the World was carried-on by *Angels*. "For unto the Angels, ſays the Apoſtle, He (God) hath not put in ſubjection the World to come; *i. e.* the αἰὼν μέλλων· the age of the *Meſſiah*, or the Goſpel-Diſpenſation. And upon this is founded a third Objection by Dr. *Morgan*, in the Preface to his Collection of Tracts; as if it were implied, that the *Jewiſh* State was in ſubjection to *Angels*; and not to the *Son of Man:* ſo that the *Word* had no management over the *Jewiſh* State, till he became the *Son of Man*; and conſequently he was not the *Jehovah Angel*.

To this the Anſwer already given is ſufficient; that the *Jewiſh* Diſpenſation was carried-on by *Chriſt*, in the Character of the *Angel* of God; being then his Miniſter and Meſſenger: But God hath *now* given him the Kingdom, ſpoken-of by *Daniel*; and made him

Lord

Lord and *Chriſt* (*m*): and he is now Κύριος, Lord, and Ἀρχηγὸς, Prince, in his *own Kingdom*; and in that Character he is conſidered as the Father of the Age to come, πατὴρ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος(*n*).

Since therefore *Chriſt* hath plainly appeared in two very different Characters; ſometimes as the *Angel of God*, when he appointed the ſeveral remarkable Periods of Time, under the *Antediluvian*, *Patriarchal*, and *Moſaic* Diſpenſations; and ſince that, as *Lord* and *King*, in his own Kingdom; There can no Argument be drawn from theſe different Characters, that the Angel *Jehovah*, and *Chriſt*, were two different Perſons; ſince a difference of *Character* in the *ſame* Perſon, will equally ſerve the Apoſtle's argument.

Laſtly, though *Grotius* denies the *Law* to be given by the ſame Perſon who gave the *Goſpel*; yet he allows, that the *Logos* was preſent at the giving of the *Law*; (though another Angel gave it, *cui adfuerit* ὁ λόγος· to whom the *Logos* was preſent) which entangles him in great difficulties. His words are theſe, on *Gal.* iii. 19. as quoted by Bp. *Bull*; agreeable to what I have already given from Archbiſhop *Teniſon*. "Illum, qui veterem Legem in *Sinai* promulgaverit, Angelum quidem fuiſſe ſingularem; aliis Angelis ſtipatum: non vero merum Angelum; ſed cui adfuerit ὁ λόγος(*o*)." He, who gave the

(*m*) *Acts* v. 31. (*n*) *Iſaiah* ix. 6. (*o*) *Bulli* Op. p. 10.

old

old Law in *Sinai*, was indeed a *ſingle* Angel, accompanied with other Angels; Yet not a *mere* Angel, but one to whom the *Logos* was preſent.

Here it is ſuppoſed by *Grotius*; that there were *many* Angels, at the giving of the Law; in order to ſhew, that the Law was given by *Angels*—and that there was *One* Angel among them *ſuperior* to the reſt; and He not a *mere* Angel; becauſe the *Logos* was preſent to *him*, by *whom* the Law was given(*p*).

Now, if the *Law* was given by *Angels*, becauſe *Angels were preſent*; then, for the ſame Reaſon, it was given by the *Logos*; becauſe *he was preſent*: and if ſo, the Logos who gave the *Law*, was the ſame Perſon as the *Logos* who gave the *Goſpel*. And if the Law *cannot* be ſaid to have been given by *Angels*, *merely* becauſe *they* were preſent; it was not given by them in *any* ſenſe at all; but only by that *one* Angel who is called *Jehovah*: for *he* only ſpake. And if he

(*p*) "Mr. *Mede* conjectures, with great probability; "that the notion of the *Jewiſh* Doctors, followed by St. "*Stephen*, and the Apoſtle [*Paul*] *that the Law was given* "*by Angels*; had its beginning from a paſſage in *Deuteron.* "xxxiii. 2. The Lord came from *Sinai* unto them, and "roſe up from *Seir* unto them: he ſhined-forth from Mount "*Paran*, &c. *Mede*'s Works, p. 344. See alſo *Pſ.* lxviii. "17. and it muſt be ſo underſtood: for it is no where ſaid "expreſsly, in the books of *Moſes*; that the Law was gi-"ven by Angels: but it ſeems a *Tradition*." See *Sykes* on *Heb.* ii. 2.

was

was not an Angel; or, what is the ſame thing, a *mere* Angel; then the Law was not given, properly ſpeaking, either by *one* mere Angel; or by *more*.

But let us hear, why that Angel was called *Jehovah*; and was not a *mere* Angel, as well as the reſt: Non merum Angelum, ſays *Grotius*; ſed cui adfuerit ὁ λόγος· He was not a *mere* Angel, becauſe the *Logos* was *preſent* to him: but if that be a ſufficient reaſon why he was not an *Angel*, or a *mere* Angel; then none of the reſt could be *mere* Angels, by whom the *Logos* was *accompanied*; for he was preſent to them all.

To avoid this Conſequence, the Favourers of this Opinion obſcure themſelves in the ſame kind of unintelligible terms; as the *Socinians* do: For, as the *Socinians* tell us, that *Chriſt* was a *mere* man; but a *God*, becauſe God was *in him*, and acted *in* him: So we are told by Bp. *Bull*, *Grotius*, &c. that the *Logos* was *in the Angel*; per aſſiſtentiam nempe et præſentiam ſingularem: *i. e.* that it was an *Angel* who *took a Body*, and the Son of God was *in* the Angel(*q*). And to make his point good, 'tis ſtrange to obſerve how Bp. *Bull* gloſſes upon *Clement Alexand.* who aſſerts the direct contrary, and ſays, λόγος ἄγγελος ἦν, the *Logos* was an Angel: Hoc eſt, ſays Bp. *Bull*

(*q*) *Bulli* Op. p. 9.

per

per Angelos apparuit: *he appeared by Angels:* which is a quite different ſenſe; if it be any at all.

The plain Queſtion is; *who* was it, that *ſpake* and *acted* at the giving of the Law? *the Angel*, to whom the *Logos* was preſent; or the *Logos himſelf?* If it was the Angel, to whom the *Logos* was preſent; then it makes no difference, as to its being a *mere Angel*; whether the *Logos* was in *him*, or no: for it will not make him an *uncreated* Angel, if he was *created*; or have any more effect upon his *metaphyſical Nature*, as an Angel; than the Holy Ghoſt's inſpiring the Apoſtles had upon their Natures as *Men*. And if it was the *Logos* himſelf, who ſpake and acted; (whether in the Angel, or not;) then it was the ſame Perſon who gave the Goſpel.

When Archbiſhop *Teniſon* ſpeaks of the appearance of the *Logos*, he conceives it to be done by the Aſſumption of ſome principal Angel, upon the greateſt and moſt ſolemn occaſions, *without any vital or perſonal Union*; and by the Miniſtry of ſome other Spirits, together with an extraordinary Motion, ſometimes in the Air, and thence in the Brain; and ſometimes in the Brain only. And he conjectures the *Angel aſſumed*, to be *Michael*; whom the *Hebrews* call the *Prince* of *Faces*, or the *Prince of the Preſence*(*r*).

(*r*) *Teniſon* on Idol. p. 334.

But

But in the 1ſt place; what can we mean, by the *Aſſumption of an Angel?* We know what we mean, by aſſuming a *Body*; or by aſſuming a *Character*: but, when we ſpeak of the *Logos*, as aſſuming the Angel, or the Perſon of an Angel, in any other ſenſe; (and eſpecially, if it be *without any vital or perſonal Union*;) we have no meaning to our words.

2dly, To what purpoſe is the *Logos* introduced; if the *Angel* could perform the whole *himſelf*, in a human Form? Or why is the Angel *Michael*, or any other introduced; if the *Logos* could do it? If the *Logos* appeared as a *Man*; he himſelf, without doubt, took upon him the *Form* of a *Man*; as he did at his *Incarnation*: and the introduction of *Michael* is unneceſſary. But ſuppoſe he *did aſſume* an *Angel*; this Angel muſt aſſume a *human* Form, to become viſible; and, if ſo, it would be the appearance of the *Angel* in the human Form; and not the appearance of the *Logos*: and accordingly, *Athanaſius* ſays; he that appeared was an *Angel*: and ſo ſay *Jerom*, *Auſtin*, and *Gregory*(*s*).

3. What Idea can men have to their words; when they ſay, the ſupreme *God* acts in the Logos, and the Logos *acts in* the Angel? There can be but *one* of theſe, who is properly, and phyſically, the *Agent*: the others, if concerned,

(*s*) *Bulli* Op. p. 10.

muſt be merely *inſtrumental*. And the Queſtion is; whether this *One*, who acted, was the *ſupreme God*, or the *Logos*, or the *Angel?* It could not be the *ſupreme God*, who ſpake when the Law was given; becauſe the Voice of the ſupreme God was never heard (*t*): and beſides he that gave the Goſpel, was his ſuperior(*u*). It could not be a *mere* Angel; becauſe he is called *Jehovah:* by which name *no other* Angel is called, but *He alone* in whom *Jehovah put his Name:* (as the ancient Fathers among the Chriſtians juſtly argued:) It could therefore be no other than the *Logos*, before he was exalted; or the *Angel ſuſtaining the Perſon of God*, whom *Grotius* ſuppoſes then preſent to ſome other Angel; *per aſſiſtentiam nempe et præſentiam ſingularem.* But as his preſence to another Angel would not make that Angel leſs a *mere* Angel, than he was before; it could be no other that ſpake, than the *Logos himſelf.*

I would farther obſerve here; that the Arguments uſed by St. *Auſtin* upon this ſubject, and quoted in *Platoniſm unveil'd*(*x*), to prove that *Chriſt* was *not* the *Jehovah* Angel, who gave the Law; are very defective: and *He* is the chief adverſary to the Doctrine.

He thinks, it was *God* who ſpake in the *Angel*; and ſaid, *I am that I am*, to *Moſes*. And

(*t*) *John* v. 37. (*u*) *Heb.* ii. 2. (*x*) Ch. 22.

this

this was the opinion of *Athanaſius* and *Jerom*. But, if this were true, how could it be ſaid; the *voice of God* was *never heard? Abraham* certainly believed, the Words ſpoken to him were ſpoken by the *very Angel* that *appeared to him*; and ſo did *Jacob*.

To this it is anſwered; the *Lord* ſpake, when the *Prophet* ſpake; and *God* ſpake *in the Angel*. But this is not true, in the *literal* Senſe; but only *figuratively*. For, though the Prophet and the Angel ſpake ſometimes in the *Name* and *Perſon* of *God*, as his *Meſſengers*; and he ordered them what to ſay, and therefore they ſpake in the *Firſt* Perſon; and ſo, in a figurative ſenſe, *God ſpake in them*; as a *King* ſpeaks in his *Ambaſſador*: yet they at other times ſpake in the *Third* Perſon: which is a demonſtration, that they were not *Pipes*, *through which* God himſelf forcibly ſpake the Words; for then *All* muſt have been in the *Firſt* Perſon(*y*). *Gregory* expreſſes himſelf much nearer the truth, when he ſays; the Angel is ſometimes called an *Angel*, and ſometimes *God*. "Angelus, quod exterius loquendo ſerviebat: Dominus, quia interius præſidens loquendi efficaciam miniſtrabat. Cum ergo loquens exterius ab interiori regitur; & per obſequium Angelus, & per inſpirationem Dominus nominatur(*z*).

(*y*) *Hoadly's* Tracts, 1715, p. 263. (*z*) *Gregorius* Prefat. in *Job*. cap 2. *Bull* 10.

This was directly the caſe with the Prophets; and *Auſtin* himſelf at laſt underſtands it ſo: *viz.* that it was the *Angel* who ſpake, and not the *ſupreme God:* for putting to himſelf this Objection—Why do we read, *God* ſaid unto *Moſes*; and not the *Angel* ſaid unto *Moſes?* he replies; "though the *Angel* ſpake, the Word *is aſcribed to the Lord, who employed him*; as we ſay, the *Judge ſpeaks*, when the *Cryer publiſhes*; the *Lord ſaid*, when the *Prophet ſpake.*" Thus it appears at laſt, that God did not ſpeak *in the Angel* or *Prophet*; but they were inſpired by *God* what to ſay, and ſpake in *his* name.

Another Argument of St. *Auſtin*'s, is as follows: "God, ſays he, appeared to *Abraham*, "in the Perſon of Three *Men*; who were, "without queſtion, Three *Angels*; though "ſome imagine, that *One* of them was *Jeſus* "*Chriſt*. But if *Jeſus Chriſt* is pretended to "be *One* of the Three, becauſe *Abraham* addreſſes himſelf to *One* of them; why is it "not minded, that the *Third*, who ſtaid with "*Abraham*, is called *Lord?* and *One* of the "other *Two*, who came to *Lot*, is called *Lord* "alſo in the *ſingular* number by the *Patriarch*; "when he makes anſwer to the *Lord*, who was "*in* the Two Angels? Therefore it is more "likely, that *Abraham* underſtood the *Lord* to

"be

" be in the *Three* Men; and that *Lot* thought " him preſent in the *Two*(*a*)."

" Here, ſays Mr. *Souverain*, we have a Key to underſtand the paſſages of the *New Teſtament*; which ſpeak of *Jeſus Chriſt* as *God himſelf:* We need ſay no more than this; that *Jeſus* was a *Man*, as to Himſelf; and a *God*, with reſpect to God *dwelling in him*."

But can any thing be more abſurd; than to imagine, that *God* commanded *Chriſt* what he ſhould ſay; (as *Chriſt* declares:) and then that *God* ſhould *ſay* it *himſelf*, being *literally in him*, and making uſe of *his Organs?*

But in what ſenſe is it ſuppoſed by *Auſtin*, that God exiſted in the three Men or Angels *literally*; in a manner different from his Omnipreſence? Could he imagine the whole Trinity to be literally in each of them; or that the Father was in one, the Son in another, and the holy Ghoſt in the third? *Cyril* of *Alexandria* ſuppoſed this to be an Apparition of the *Trinity* in *Unity*; becauſe three appeared, and *Abraham* ſpake as unto One(*b*). But, if this were the caſe, the Trinity was divided. And how the undivided Trinity could exiſt in the two that were left, after the third had aſcended; is no leſs difficult to conceive.

(*a*) Aug. de Civitat. Dei Lib. 16, cap. 29. (*b*) *Cyr.* con. *Jul.* l. 1. p. 20. *Tenifon* on Idol. p. 326.

The

The Words of *Chriſt* admit of no ſuch *literal meaning*; when he ſays, *I am in the Father*; and *the Father in me. Believe the Works*, ſays he; [*i. e.* the Miracles which he wrought] *that ye may know and believe, that the Father is in Me, and I in Him.* [*John* x. 38.] The ſenſe is; that his Works would prove him to be aſſiſted by the Power of God, and to act by his Authority: whereas, if the Words are interpreted in a *literal* ſenſe, the Argument is not concluſive: for the working Miracles was no more a proof of any *literal* Union or In-dwelling of God the Father, in his Son *Jeſus Chriſt*; than it was of a *literal* Union between *God* and the *Apoſtles:* The power of God might have operated in the ſame miraculous manner, whether God was *literally* in *Chriſt*, or *not*. The words therefore are *figurative*; as when *Chriſt* prays, *that They* (his Diſciples) *all may be* One, *as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee; that they* (the Diſciples) *alſo may be* One *with us.* And, as St. *Paul* ſays(*c*); *Ye are all* One *in Chriſt Jeſus.*

But to go-on with St. *Auſtin*'s Argument. He ſays; "If *Jeſus Chriſt* is pretended to be one of the three, becauſe *Abraham* addreſſes himſelf to *one* of them, [whom he calls *Lord*;] why is it not minded, that the *third*, who ſtaid with *Abraham*, is called *Lord*; and one of

(*c*) *Gal.* iii. 28. *Whitby*'s Laſt Thoughts, p. 72, 64.

the

the other two who came to *Lot*, is called *Lord* too; in the ſingular Number?"

In anſwer to this; it muſt be obſerved, and is very remarkable; that Jehovah *appeared*, [xviii. 1.] and Jehovah *promiſed Abraham* a Son, [14.] and Jehovah *diſcourſed* with *Abraham*, [17.] and Jehovah *went away*, when he had done ſpeaking to *Abraham*, [33.] and the *Glory* of the Lord, or *Shechinah*, was *lifted-up*; as it is in the *Chaldee:* and when the other two Angels, who where left, ſpeak of him who was *lifted-up*, they call him *Jehovah:* [xix. 13.] But the two who were left were *not* called *Jehovah*, but *Adonai*; [xix. 2.] and in the eighteenth verſe, though it be κύριε, ſingular, in the *Greek*, it is in the *Hebrew Adonai*; as *Abraham* addreſſed himſelf to the three altogether: [xviii. 3.] and it does not appear, that *Abraham* believed *Jehovah* to be in *either* of the two who ſtaid, or that *either* of them was *Jehovah*; for he calls *neither* of them by *that* Name: [See *Heb.* xiii. 2.] much leſs reaſon have we to think, he believed *Jehovah* to be in *all three*; or that *Lot* believed him to be in *two of them*. And, if *Moſes* had thought ſo, he would have called them *all* by the *ſame Name*; and not have diſtinguiſhed them ſo preciſely, by calling the one *Jehovah*, and the others *Adonai*.

Biſhop

Biſhop *Clayton* ſeems to be no leſs miſtaken, in his *Eſſay* on *Spirit*(*d*), when he ſays; "It "was one of thoſe who appeared, that is called "*Jehovah*, who rained upon *Sodom* and *Gomor-* "*rha* Brimſtone and Fire, from *Jehovah* out "of Heaven." It ſeems rather to have been the *Jehovah*, who had juſt left *Abraham*, and was lifted-up; or *Jehovah* in Heaven might have rained it from *himſelf*. The repetition of the Noun, inſtead of the Pronoun, is not without precedent(*e*).

(*d*) P. 56. (*e*) *Gen.* i. 27. II. *Chron.* vii. 2. *Pſ.* l. 22, 23. *John* iii. 14 to 19. *Luke* xviii. 8. See page 247.

END OF THE SECOND LETTER.

LETTER THE THIRD.

Jeſum Chriſtum, hoc eſt, eum qui poſtea *Jeſ. Chriſtus* dictus eſt, ante ſuam ἐναθρώπησιν, ſive ex beatiſſima Virgine ſecundum carnem nativitatem, in natura alterâ, humana longe excellentiori, extitiſſe; ſanctis viris, velut in præludium incarnationis ſuæ, apparuiſſe; Eccleſiæ, quam olim ſanguine ſuo redempturus eſſet, ſemper præfuiſſe ac proſpexiſſe; adeoque a primordio omnem ordinem divinæ diſpoſitionis (ut *Tertullianus* loquitur) per ipſum decucurriſſe; quin et ante jacti mundi fundamenta Deo Patri ſuo adfuiſſe, perque ipſum condita fuiſſe hæc univerſa; Catholici Doctores trium primorum ſæculorum, uno omnes ore docuerunt. BULLI *Opera*, Sect. i.

IN my laſt Letter I laid it down to be proved that God crëated the World by the *Angel Jehovah*; who is called the *Word* of God: and hath from the beginning carried-on the Government of it, and will finally complete the great End for which it was made, by the mini-

ſtration of the ſame Perſon and Angel; who appeared to our Fathers by the Name of *Jehovah*. And this I propoſed to conſider and prove; Firſt, from the Reaſon and Probability of the thing itſelf; 2dly, from the Words of Scripture; and 3dly, from the Interpretation of Scripture, by the moſt ancient Commentators and Men of Learning, among the *Jews* and *Chriſtians*; both ancient and modern. The two firſt of theſe Proofs I have already compleated; and the third ſhall be the Subject of this third Letter.

The moſt ancient Interpretation of our Scriptures is the *Chaldee* Paraphraſe, or Targum of *Onkelos*; written, as it is probable, before the *Chriſtian* Æra (*a*): in which it is very remarkable, that the Author (though his Book is rather a Verſion, than a Paraphraſe;) has thought proper to explain the word *Jehovah*, in many places; (that is, wherever it appeared plainly to ſignify the *Jehovah Angel*) by the words *Mimara Jehovæ*, the Word of *Jehovah* (*b*): which directly anſwers to the word *Logos*, uſed by St. *John* and the other Apoſtles of *Chriſt*, to de-

(*a*) See *Prideaux* Connec. vol. III. b. 8. "I reckon them both [the Targums of *Onkelos* and *Jonathan*,] to have been compoſed before our Saviour's time; and the Targum of *Onkelos* to be the ancienter of the two." For which he gives his reaſons; p. 543.

(*b*) *Bulli* Op. p. 14.

ſcribe

ſcribe that Perſon by whom God made the World: and the ſame Words are alſo uſed by [*Jonathan*] the *Jeruſalem* Paraphraſt(*c*).

But this argument will appear in the ſtronger light, if we compare the verbal Tranſlation of the Original *Hebrew* with that of the Paraphraſe in the *Targums*(*d*).

The

(*c*) "Some Criticks, ſays Dr. *Allix*, believe our Saviour does cite *Jonathan*'s Paraphraſe, *Luke* iv. 18. in quoting the Text *Iſ.* lxi. 1. Thus much, at leaſt, may be ſaid for it; that all there cited does agree better with the *Targum*, than with the Original Text, p. 15.—It ſeems moſt likely, ſays Dr. *Prideaux*; they were read out of ſome *Chaldee* Targum, which was made uſe of in that Synagogue: and when *Chriſt* cried out; *Eli, Eli, lamah ſabactbani*; *Mat.* xxvii. 46. he quoted not out of the *Hebrew* Text, but out of the *Chaldee* Paraphraſe: for in the *Hebrew* Text is *Eli, Eli, lamah Azabtani:* the word *Sabactbani* is no where to be found, but in the *Chaldee* Tongue, p. 547. *Allix*; 85 to 91.

(*d*)

HEBREW *Text* tranſlated.	CHALDEE *Paraphraſe* of ONKELOS tranſlated.
Gen. xxviii. 20. And *Jacob* vowed a vow, ſaying; If God will be with me, &c. then ſhall *Jehovah* be my God.	*Gen* xxviii. 20. —— If the *Word of Jehovah* be with me, then ſhall the *Word of Jehovah* be my God.
Ex. xvi. 8. Your murmurings are not againſt us; but againſt *Jehovah*.	*Ex.* xvi. 8. Your murmurings are not againſt us; but againſt the *Word of Jehovah*.
Ex. xix. 17. And *Moſes* brought forth the people out of the Camp, to meet with *Jehovah*.	*Ex.* xix. 17. —— to meet *the Word of Jehovah*.

The *Jeruſalem* Targum of *Jonathan* is another of our ancient Paraphraſes; though not ſo old as

Lev. xx. 23. Ye ſhall not walk in the Manners of the Nations which I caſt-out before you: for they committed all theſe things; therefore I abhorred them.

Lev. xx. 23. ——therefore *my Word* abhorred them.

Lev. xxvi. 46. Theſe are the Statutes and Judgments, and Laws, which *Jehovah* made.

Lev. xxvi. 46. —— which the *Word of Jehovah* made.

Numb. xi. 20. Becauſe that ye have deſpiſed *Jehovah*, which is among you.

Numb. xi. 20. —— deſpiſed the *Word of Jehovah*, whoſe *Shechinah* dwelleth among you.

Numb. xxiii. 21. *Jehovah* his God is with him; and the Shout of a King is among them.

Numb. xxii. 21. The *Word of Jehovah* their God is with them; and the *Shechinah*, or divine preſence of their King is among them.

Deut. xx. 1. Be not afraid of them; *for Jehovah thy God* is with thee, which brought thee up out of the Land of *Egypt*.

Deut. xx. 1. —— for *Jehovah* thy God, his *Word* is for thee.

Deut. i. 30. *Jehovah* your God, which goeth before you; he ſhall fight for you.

Deut. i. 30. *Jehovah* your God, which goeth before you; his *Word* ſhall fight for you, &c. And ſo, *Deut.* iii. 22.

Deut. ii. 7. Theſe forty years, *Jehovah* thy God hath been with thee.

Deut. ii. 7. —— the *Word* of *Jehovah* thy God hath been with thee.

Deut.

as that of *Onkelos*: [according to Dr. *Prideaux*:] which explains this Doctrine in the ſame manner(*e*).

Theſe

Deut. iv. 24. For *Jehovah* thy God is a conſuming Fire.	*Deut.* iv. 24. For *Jehovah* thy God, *his Word* is a conſuming Fire.
Deut. i. 31. Yet in this thing ye did not believe *Jehovah* your God.	*Deut.* i. 31. —— ye did not believe the *Word of Jehovah* your God.
Deut. iv. 37. He brought thee out *in his Sight*, with his mighty power.	*Deut.* iv. 37 He brought thee forth *by his Word*, &c.
Deut. v. 5. I ſtood between *Jehovah* and you, at that time.	*Deut.* v. 5. I ſtood between his *Word Jehovah* and you.
Deut. ix. 3. *Jehovah* thy God is he that goeth before thee [as] a conſuming Fire.	*Deut.* ix. 3. *Jehovah* thy God, &c. *his Word* is a conſuming Fire.
Deut. xxxi. 6. *Jehovah* thy God, he it is that goeth with thee.	*Deut.* xxxi. 6. *Jehovah* thy God, *his Word* goeth before thee.
Deut. xxi. 8. And *Jehovah* he it is that goeth before thee; *he* will be with thee.	*Deut.* xxi. 8. And *Jehovah* he it is that goeth before thee; *his Word* will be with thee.

(*e*)

Hebrew *Text.*	Jerusalem *Paraphraſe.*
Gen. i. 27. *Jehovah* crëated man in his own image.	*Gen.* i. 27. And the *Word* of *Jehovah* crëated man.
Gen. iii. 9. And *Jehovah* God called unto *Adam*.	*Gen.* iii. 9. And the *Word* of *Jehovah* called *Adam*.
Gen. iii. 22. And *Jehovah* God ſaid, Behold the man is become as one of us.	*Gen.* iii. 22. And the *Word* of *Jehovah* ſaid, Behold, &c.

Gen.

Theſe few quotations from the *Targums*, when compared with the original *Hebrew*, are ſufficient to ſhew; that the *Jehovah*, who appeared to our Fathers, was the *Word* of *Jehovah*; according to the Opinion of theſe ancient Writers: that is, he was the ſame Perſon who made the World, and who is called, by the Apoſtles, the *Logos*, or *Word* of *God*.

From hence, and from the Language of other *Hebrews* upon this Subject, *Rittangelius*, the Annotator upon the Book *Jezirah*, concludes; that the moſt learned and ancient of the *Hebrew*

Gen. xviii. 1. And *Jehovah* God appeared to him in the plains of *Mamre*.

Gen. xix. 24. Then *Jehovah* rained upon *Sodom* and *Gomorrha*, brimſtone, &c.

Gen. xxi. 33. And *Abraham* planted a grove in *Beerſheba*, and called there on the name of *Jehovah*, the everlaſting God.

Gen. xxii. 14. And *Abraham* called the name of that place *Jehovah-Jireh*.

Gen. xxxv. 9. And God *Jehovah* appeared to *Jacob* again, when he came out of *Padan Aram*; and bleſſed him.

Gen. xviii. 1. And the *Word* of *Jehovah* God was revealed, &c.

Gen. xix. 24. And the *Word* of *Jehovah* God rained fire and brimſtone, violently, &c.

Gen. xxi. 33. And *Abraham* confeſſed and prayed in the name of the *Word* of *Jehovah* the everlaſting God.

Gen. xxii. 14. And *Abraham* deprecated in the name *Verbi ejus Jehovæ*.

Gen. xxxv. 9. And the *Word* of *Jehovah* bleſſed them; and the *Word* of *Jehovah* ſaid unto them, Increaſe and multiply.

Divines

Divines from the days of *Abraham*, as the Writings of the modern *Jews* do teſtify, have uſed the Term *Mimara*, [the *Word*,] and their Poſterity alſo, for ſome thouſand years, in their Synagogues; as a common Term(*f*).

It has been objected to this Opinion; that the ſame word *Mimara* is uſed by the *Chaldee* Paraphraſts to explain the *Hebrew* word *Dabar*, *Speech* or *Diſcourſe*; but this *Rittangelius* abſolutely denies. And Dr. *Allix* obſerves alſo of the word *Rithgama*, [*Matter* or *Diſcourſe*, as ῥῆμα ſignifies in the *Greek*] that the *Targums* always diſtinguiſh it from *Mimara*. P. 183.

But when *Rittangelius* aſſerts; that the word *Mimara* is never uſed, except *de ſecundo in Deitate ſubſiſtendi modo*; by which he means the *Logos*—I preſume, he ought to have ſaid; they never uſed it, but when they *imagined* that the *Logos* was the Perſon meaned in the Text; in which they might be ſometimes miſtaken: as

(*f*) Patere hinc quoque univerſis & ſingulis ſacræ paginæ addictis abſque dubio cenſeo; antiquiſſimos et doctiſſimos Hebræorum Theologos ab *Abrahami* tempore, ut recentiorum Hebræorum libri teſtantur, hunc terminum ממרא (quod *Verbum* Latine interpretamur) & poſteros etiam aliquot millibus annorum in Synagogis pro communi termino uſurpaſſe; quod tam ex paraphraſibus *Chaldaicis Onkelos*, *Jonathan* filii *Uzielis*, *Jeroſolymitana* veteris Teſtamenti, quam ex aliorum Antiquorum Rabinorum ſcriptis & fragmentis manifeſtum eſt. Lib. *Jezirah* a *Rittangelio*. *Amſt.* 1642. p. 97.

when

when they uſe the word in, *Iſaiah* xlii. 1. (where it is ſaid of *Meſſiah*, by God the Father; "my Elect, in whom *my Word* delighteth;") *Imagining*, as it ſeems, that the *Elect* here ſpoken of was ſent by the Angel of *Jehovah*, as other Prophets were; and not knowing, that it was the *very Angel himſelf*.—And ſo in other places Men may differ and miſtake which of the two is ſpoken-of; the Sender, or the Sent; as they are both called by the ſame name, *Jehovah*, in the Original. But, when the *Jehovah* actually appears, and perſonally ſpeaks; there can be no miſtake. Had they underſtood the Prophecy of *Malachi* iii. 1. that the *Meſſiah* was the *Mimara Jehovæ*, or the Angel of the Covenant; 'tis probable they would not have tranſlated this paſſage of *Iſaiah*, as they have done: but of the *inviſible Jehovah* delighting in his *Word*.

Mr. *Souverain*, the ſuppoſed Author of *Platoniſm Unveil'd*, ſpeaking of theſe Paraphraſts, ſays; "Theſe Paraphraſts, by the *Word*, de-
"ſigned only the *Angel, who bare the name of*
"*God*; and who ſpake in his ſtead; this *Term*
"being peculiarly appropriated to *Meſſengers*
"and Interpreters. We likewiſe ſee the Au-
"thor of the Book of *Wiſdom* did thus call
"the *deſtroying Angel*(g), ſent to kill the firſt-
"born of *Egypt*; becauſe he was intruſted

(g) Wiſdom xviii. 15.

"with

" with the Command of God therein, and the " Execution of it." Mr. *Souverain* judges here very juſtly; that the *Word* of God is a *Perſon*; the *Angel*, in whom God put his Name: but he does not ſeem aware, that there is but *One ſuch Angel* that we read of(*b*). And had He conſidered *this* Angel to be the *ſame* Perſon, who afterwards took Fleſh; and *theſe appearances* to be, as Biſhop *Bull* calls them, *præludia & figuræ futuræ Incarnationis*; he would have had a plain ſcheme before him, free from the difficulties of the other *Socinians*.

On the other hand, a Writer in the *Unitarian Tracts*(*i*), ſays; " I do not perceive, that any of Biſhop *Bull*'s Citations out of theſe Paraphraſes ſpeak of the *Word* as a *Perſon*; but only as the *Energy* or *Power* of God." In anſwer to this, I ſhould think it ſufficient merely to refer to two of the Biſhop's Citations(*k*): the firſt from *Gen.* xx. 3. *Et venit Verbum a facie Dei ad* Abimelech; and the *Lord* came from the Face of God to *Abimelech:* and the other

(*b*) See Euſeb. Eccleſ. Hiſt. B. 1. ch. 2. Neither is it lawful once to ſurmiſe that the apparitions of *God* in the Scripture, if at any time any of them appeared unto Men, may be attributed to the inferior Angels and Miniſters of God: for neither doth the Scripture if any of them at any time appeared unto men conceal the ſame; expreſsly ſaying, not that God or the Lord, but that *Angels* ſpake, &c.

(*i*) Vol. III. Tr. vii. p. 61. (*k*) *Bulli* Op. p. 14.

Pſ. cx. 1. *Dixit Dominus Verbo ſuo, ſede a dextris meis*; The Lord ſaid to his *Word*, Sit thou on my right hand. However, Dr. *Allix* obſerves; the *perſonal* Characters of Action, of Commanding, of Anſwering, of giving Laws, of iſſuing-out Decrees, of being Prayed-to, of receiving Worſhip, and the like; are ſo expreſsly given in the *Chaldee* Paraphraſes to that *Word* we now treat-of; as render it abſurd to take it for any thing elſe but a *Perſon*(*l*).

(*l*) *Allix*, p. 191. The Paraphraſts make it the *Word* of the Lord, that appeared to the Ancients, under the name of the *Angel* of the Lord. P. 183.

It was the *Word* of the Lord, that ſaved *Noah*, and made a Covenant with him, and ſhut the door of the Ark.

The *Word* appeared to *Abraham*, by the name of the *God of Heaven*; and ſlew the firſt-born of *Egypt*. *Jeruſ. Targ.* on *Ex.* xi. 3.

It was the *Word*, which talked with *Moſes* in the Tabernacle; and whoſe appearance was promiſed to paſs before him, in *Ex.* xxxiii. 19.

The *Jeruſalem Targum* on *Deut.* xxvi. 17. ſays; You have made the *Word* of the Lord King over you this day, that he may be your Glory: and, [verſe 18.] the *Word* of the Lord is become King over you *in his own Name*, as over his beloved and peculiar People. 224.

Laſtly, to mention no more; the Targum of *Jonathan* on *Pſ.* cx. 1. is thus paraphraſed: And the Lord ſaid to his *Word*, Sit thou on my right-hand; which could not be ſaid poſſibly of any but a *Perſon*, nor could it be ſaid of the *Father*. See *Bulli* Op. p. 14.

From

From these and many other Texts, quoted by Dr. *Allix* to the same purpose, he concludes: "In short, the ancient Church considered the *Word* as being the Soverain "Lord and King of the *Jewish* People(*m*); "and a different Person from the Father:" And Bishop *Pearson* says; "I conceive the *Chaldee* Paraphrases to represent the sense of the *Jews* of that Age; as being their public Interpretation of the Scripture: wherefore, what we find frequent in *it*, we cannot but think the Vulgar and General Opinion of that Nation." And he informs us; that, "what the *Chaldee* "*Paraphrasts* call *Mimara*, *Verbum*; the *Hel*-"*lenists* named *Logos*: as appears by *Philo* the "*Jew*; who wrote before St. *John*."

And St. *Jerom*, on *Ezek.* i. 24. notes; that the *Greek* interpreters sometimes render God's name *El Shaddai*, *God Almighty*, by *Logos*; and so it was understood by *Onkelos*; who considered them as the same Person(*n*). And Bishop *Pearson* says; "we are not to look upon *Philo* as a *Platonist*; but merely as a *Jew*, who refers his whole Doctrine of this *Logos*, to the first Chapter of *Genesis*. And the rest of the *Jews* before him, used the same notion; who had no such Knowledge out of *Plato's* School. And that *Celsus*, writing in the *Person* of a *Jew*,

(*m*) *Allix*, Judgm. of the Jew. Church, p. 239, 150, 120. (*n*) Ibid. 207.

acknowledges the *Word* is the *Son* of *God*; εἶγε ὁ λόγος ἔστιν ὑμῖν υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐπαινοῦμεν(*o*). And though *Origen* objects, that in this *Celſus* makes the *Jew* ſpeak improperly; becauſe thoſe which he converted did never acknowledge that *Son* of God was the *Word:* yet *Celſus's Jew* did ſpeak the language of *Philo*. But between the time of *Celſus* and that of *Origen*, (I gueſs about ſixty years) the *Jews* had learned to deny that Notion of the *Logos*; that they might with more colour reject St. *John*(*p*)."

Now the belief of *Philo* was this; Firſt, the Father of the Univerſe(*q*); then, a ſecond God(*r*), who is his *Word*; whom he calls the *true Word* of God, his firſt-begotten Son(*s*). He attributes the Crëation of the World to this *Logos*; whom he terms the *Inſtrument* of God, by whom the World was made(*t*): and ſays; the *Word* is the *Shadow* of God, whom he employed in making the World(*u*). Where we muſt obſerve; that *Philo* makes the *Logos* inſtrumental in the Crëation of the World, yet he taketh it not for a bare expreſſion of the

(*o*) Orig. con. Cel. l. II.

(*p*) *Pearſon*; p. 118.

(*q*) Παλαίρα τῶν ὅλων.

(*r*) Δεύτερον Θεὸν, ὅς ἐστιν ἐκείνου Λόγος. *Quæſt.* & *Sol.*

(*s*) Ὀρθὸν Θεοῦ Λόγον πρωτόγονον υἱόν· de Agric.

(*t*) Ὄργανον Θεοῦ δι' οὗ ὁ κόσμος κατεσκευάσται· de Flam. Glad.

(*u*) Σκιὰ δὲ Θεοῦ ὁ Λόγος ἀυτοῦ ἐστιν, ᾧ καθάπερ ὀργάνῳ προσχρησάμενος ἐκοσμοποίει, Alleg. l. ii.

Will

Will of God; but for a *God*, though in the ſecond degree; and expreſsly for the *Word* of God(*x*). He tells us, that the *Angel* who came to *Jacob* was the *Word*, the *Miniſter* of God(*y*); calling him the *Deputy*(*z*) of the great King; and ſays, his Authority was not ſupreme; but *ſubordinate*(*a*), and *inferior* to God; but *ſuperior* to man(*b*): and calls him the *Image of God*(*c*), as St. *Paul* does; and his *Effigies* and *Character*, as St. *Paul* alſo does(*d*): this the *French* tranſlate, *l'Empreinte de ſa Perſonne*; which anſwers to another expreſſion of *Philo*'s, when he calls the Father σφραγὶς(*e*)· the original *Seal*, of which the eternal Word is the *Impreſſion:* that he ſits at the Helm, and governs all things(*f*): that God, as a King and

(*x*) *Pearſon.*

(*y*) Ὑπηρέτης τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος· de Nom. *Met.* p. 1058. *Jackſon*; 396.

(*z*) Ὕπαρχον τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως· de Som. & de Ag. l. ii.

(*a*) Οὐκ ἀυτοκράτορος μὲν, ὑπάρχου δὲ καὶ θαυμαστῆς ἡγεμονίας· de Profug. p. 466.

(*b*) Μεθόριός τις Θεοῦ φύσις, τοῦ μὲν ἑλάττων, ἀνθρώπου δὲ κρείττων· de Som. 11, 34.

(*c*) De Monar. & de Som. interdum ἀπεικόνισμα, ut lib. Pejorem inſidiari meliori; & χαρακτὴρ. ii. de Agri. ad *Grot.* de Ver. lib. v.

(*d*) *Col.* i. 15. Εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀοράτου· *Heb.* xv. 1, 3. Χαρακτὴρ.

(*e*) Σφραγὶς ἧς ὁ χαρακτὴρ ἐστιν ὁ ἀΐδιος Λόγος· See *Pyle* on *Heb. i.*

(*f*) De Cherub. p. 80.

Shepherd,

Shepherd, rules according to Law and Right; and places over us his firſt-begotten Son: who as the *Pro-Rex* of the great King, takes care of the ſacred Flock(*g*). He alſo calls him the *Firſt-begotten* of the Father, before all Creatures (*h*); [agreeably to St. *Paul*, who calls him the *Firſt-born* of the whole Creation (*i*); and to St. *John*, who calls him the *Beginning* of the Creation of God (*k*):] and the *Firſt-begotten* Son, *Vicegerent* of the great King, the Angel or *Ambaſſador that hath the care of the Univerſe* (*l*); an *Archangel* (*m*): and he accounts the Voice to *Adam*, to *Abraham*, to *Jacob*, to *Moſes* from the Buſh, to be the effect of the *Logos* of God (*n*): and with reſpect to his rule over us, he ſtiles him μεθόριος καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἡμῶν τῶν ἀτελῶν Θεός: a Mediator, and a High Prieſt, and a God, over us imperfect Creatures.

The Book of the Wiſdom of *Solomon*, ſuppoſed by ſome to have been written by *Philo*; [Biſhop *Bull* ſays, long before *Philo*(*o*)] ſpeaks of the *Word* in the ſame manner; as the *Perſon*

(*g*) De Agricul. p. 152.

(*h*) Πρεσβύταλόος τῶν γένεσιν εἰληφότων. See *Prov.* viii. 22. in the LXX.

(*i*) *Col.* i. 15. Πρωτότοκος πάσης κλίσεως.

(*k*) *Rev.* iii. 14. ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κλισεως τῦ Θεῦ.

(*l*) Lib. de *Herode* don. & Lib. de Confuſione.

(*m*) In Alleg. & Lib. de Cherub. *Grot.* de ver. l. 5.

(*n*) De Vita *Moſis*; p. 394, 395.

(*o*) Defence of the Nic. Faith, 18.

who

who delivered the *Iſraelites* from *Egypt*, and brought the Plagues upon the *Egyptians* (*p*); *Grotius* alſo thinks this book is more ancient, and written under *Simon* the high Prieſt, who flouriſhed under *Ptolemy Lagus*; but that the *Greek* was made by ſome *Chriſtian*. But in anſwer to that bold conjecture, Dr. *Allix* obſerves, that the Book was among the *Jews* in *Chaldaic*, till the thirteenth Century; as appears by *Rambam*'s preface to the *Pentateuch* (*q*): and they never objected ſuch an Interpolation; but thought it worthy of *Solomon*, and probably *His* (*r*).

R. Menahem (*s*) allegeth from the ancient Rabbins, and brings the very words of the Authors which lived before him; that the *Angel* who appeared in the Buſh, was *Michael* (*t*); and

(*p*) Wiſd. xviii. 14, 15, 16.

(*q*) *Allix* on the Jewiſh Church.

(*r*) The paſſage which *Rambam* or *Moſes Ben Nachman* quotes from the *Chaldee*, are Ch. vii. 5, 6, 7, and part of the 8th verſe; and again, v. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. from whence *Shikardus* proves againſt St. *Jerom*, that the *Greek* is not the original, but was tranſlated out of the Chaldee. See *Joſ. Mede* on II *Peter* iii. p. 614.

(*s*) Vide *Ainſworth*, ad loc.

(*t*) Abp. *Teniſon* ſays; "it was the joint opinion of "*Juſtin Martyr*, *Euſebius*, *Theodoret*, and the moſt learned "Archbiſhop of *Armagh*; [*Uſher* in Annal. Vet. Teſt. p. "21. Ed. *Par.*] that it was the *Logos*, who ſhewed himſelf to *Joſhua* in the form of a Man; and called himſelf "the

and was the *Angel*, the *Redeemer*, who ſaid to *Jacob*, *I am the God of Bethel*: this is he, of whom

" the Captain of the Lord's Hoſt. But that a Fragment " of an ancient and venerable Scholion will have it to be " *Michael*; and not the very Son of God." *Teniſon* on Idol. p. 366.

But to this it may be anſwered; If the Author of this *Scholion* believed *Michael* to be the *Logos*, he was of the ſame opinion with the Fathers and Rabbins. See the opinion of *Euſebius* in the 2d. chap. of his Eccleſ. Hiſt. together with the Scholion here referred-to, with remarks upon it at the end of the Poſtſcript to this Letter.

Mr. *Ainſworth*, on *Exod.* xiv. 19. ſays; this Angel, who went before the Camp of *Iſrael*, is *Chriſt*; called *Jehovah*, *Ex.* xiii. 21. And the *Hebrew* Doctors have acknowledged this Angel to be *Michael*; the great Prince, who was made a Wall of Fire between the *Iſraelites* and the *Egyptians*. *Pirke Eleezer*; ch. xlii. *David Kimchi* on *Hoſea* xii. 4. ſays; this Angel was *Michael*; and on *Gen.* xlviii. 16. the Angel which redeemed me from all Evil: And, on *Gen.* xxxii. 24. Mr. *Ainſworth* ſays directly, *Michael* is *Chriſt* the Archangel; and quotes, for proof of it, *Dan.* x. 21.—*Jude* ix. —*Rev.* xii. 7. The Words of the Angel to *Daniel*, are theſe; there is none that holdeth with me in theſe things, but *Michael* your Prince: and he is deſcribed [xii. 1.] as the great Prince that ſtandeth for the Children of the *Jewiſh* People.—St. *Jude* repreſents *Michael* to be the Archangel who contended about the Body of *Moſes*: [verſe 9.] and *Michael* is repreſented in the Apocalypſe, as the Angel who with *his* Angels fought againſt the old Serpent, called the *Devil* and *Satan*; whom the Brethren overcame, by the Blood of the *Lamb*; [xii. 11.] and thereby brought on the Kingdom of God, and the power of his *Chriſt*: [verſe 10.] all which ſeems to favour the opinion of our *Rabbins*.

whom it is ſaid, the *Angel of the Preſence* ſaved them. And on *Exod.* xxiii. 20, 21. where it is

Rabbins. But Mr. *Joſeph Mede* objects; that the deſcription of the Angel, given by *Daniel*; agrees with the deſcription of *Chriſt*, given in the Revelation; [i. 13.] and from thence he argues; If *Chriſt* be *Michael*, why does he ſay, [*Dan.* x.] that *Michael*, one of the chief Princes, came to help him: and, [verſe 21.] none holdeth with me, but *Michael* your Prince? Compare *Dan.* xii. 6, 7. with *Rev.* x. to verſe 7.

But the Texts here referred-to by Mr. *Mede*, do not amount to a proof, that the Angel who ſpake to *Daniel*, [x. 5.] was *Michael*: It ſeems more probable to have been *Gabriel*; he being the Perſon that had all along explained the *Revelation*; [*Dan.* ix. 21—viii. 6.—x. 10.] upon which account he is called, by the *Perſians*, the Angel of *Revelation*. *Sale*'s Koran, ch. ii. p. 13. Note.—In confirmation that it was not *Michael* who ſpake to *Daniel*, I would obſerve farther; that there were *Two* anointed ones, that ſtood before the Face of the Lord of the whole Earth: [*Zech.* iv.] the one of which ſeems to be *Michael*; which ſtandeth for the Children of *Iſrael*, and is declared to be one of the chief Princes; [*Dan.* x. 13.] and the other *Gabriel*, who declares himſelf alſo to be one that ſtandeth in the Preſence of God: [*Luke* i. 19.] and *Philo* ſays, it was a Type of this; that, at the building of the Tabernacle, God directed only *two* Cherubim to be placed over the Mercy-ſeat, in the Holy of Holies: [Vita *Moſis*; l. iii. p. 669. —*Eſſay* on *Spirit*, p. 75] And *Origen*, as we are told by *Jerom*, interpreted the two *Seraphim*, [*Iſ.* vi.] to be the *Son* and the *Holy Ghoſt*. Reply to Dr. *Waterland*'s Defence, p. 329. And *Manaſſeth Ben Iſrael* ſuppoſed the Lord upon Earth, who rained Fire, to be the Angel *Gabriel*; [*Gen.* xix. 24.] but the Angel *Gabriel* is not called *Jehovah*; and

is ſaid, I will ſend my *Angel*; *R. Menahem* teacheth, from the Ancient Rabbins; that *this Angel*, the Lord, who rained Fire, was the ſame *Jehovah* that aſcended.

Now as there are *Two* anointed ones, it is no wonder if they are both repreſented as appearing in great Glory; and therefore in many reſpects alike. But it muſt be obſerved; that the deſcription of the Angel in the *Revelation* is only in *Viſion*, and appropriates the Glory to *Chriſt*: for it is plain the Angel ſpeaks in *his* Name, when he ſays; "I am He that liveth and was dead, and have the Keys "of Death and Hell:" and ſo he ſpeaks, [*Rev.* xi. 13.] "and I will give power to my *two* Witneſſes." And *Chriſt* declared to *John*, the Revelation which God had given to him; not in *Perſon*, but by his Angel in *Viſion*: [*Rev.* i. 1.] and this Angel might be *Gabriel*. And, if this were the caſe, that the Angel deſcribed in *Daniel* was *Gabriel*; Mr. *Mede*'s Objection is of no force againſt the Opinion of our *Rabbins*, and many of the *Chriſtians*; that *Chriſt* is the Arch-angel *Michael*. But I only mention this queſtion by the way; it does not affect my Argument either way. 'Tis certain, the *Jews* generally held; that He, who is ſtiled the Captain of the Lord's Hoſt, [*Joſh.* v. 14.] was the Angel *Michael*. And his office, ſays *Origen*, is to preſent the Prayers and Supplications of Men; and in the Book of the *Paſtor* we read, ſays he; that *Chriſtians*, as ſoon as they believe, are under the Government of *Michael*: the good Meſſenger, according to *Hermas*, being *Michael*; who hath the Government over his People: whence, by *Nicephorus*, he is called the Preſident or Overſeer of the *Chriſtian* Faith. *Whitby* on *Col.* ii. 18. And it was as ancient a Notion as *Cerinthus*; that He, who gave the *Law*, was one of the Angels who made the *World*. *Epiphan. Hær.* 28, ſect i. p. 110. And this is thought to have firſt given riſe to the worſhip of Angels among the Chriſtians.

Both

Angel, whom God ſent before the *Iſraelites*; declaring, *my Name is in him*; is the *Angel* the *Redeemer*. And on *Exod.* xiv. 19. he ſays; the *Angel*, who went before the *Iſraelites*, was [*Shechinah*] the *Preſence of God*; and called an *Angel* and *Prince* of the World, becauſe the Government of the World is *in his hands*(*u*). And on *Ex.* xxxiii. 14. where it is ſaid, My *Preſence* ſhall go with Thee; he explains this to be the Angel the *Redeemer*, as it is written in *Iſaiah* lxiii. 9. *the Angel of his Preſence ſaved them:* and in *Mal.* iii. 1. *the Angel of the Covenant, whom ye delight in.* And *R. Samuel*, in *Mecor Chaim*, calls him both *Angel* and *Jehovah*.

The Note of *R. Moſes Ben Nachman* on *Gen.* xlviii. 16(*x*). is to the ſame purpoſe; and very remarkable. "The *Redeeming* Angel is he, that anſwered *Jacob* in the time of his Affliction; and who ſaid to him, *I am the God of Bethel*; and he; of whom it is ſaid, my *Name* is in him." The like he has on *Ex.* iii. where the appearance in the Buſh is mentioned: "This is he, of whom it is ſaid; *God* called *Moſes* out of the

Both *Theodoret* and *Jerom*, in their Comments on *Dan.* xi. 21. ſay; that *Michael* was the Arch-angel to whom was committed the care of the People of the *Jews:* and the Author of the *Recognitions*, that the Government of the *Jews* themſelves, and the diſpoſal of their affairs were by God committed to an Arch-angel. *Whitby* on *Heb.* ii. 5.

(*u*) *Pirke Eleez.* 42. *Ainſworth* on *Ex.* xiv. 19.

(*x*) *Grot.* Not. ad lib. v. de Verit.

Buſh. He is called an *Angel*, becauſe he *governs the World*; for it is written in one place, and *Jehovah* [that is, the *Lord God*] brought us out of *Egypt*; and in another place, he ſent his *Angel*, and brought us out of *Egypt*; and again the *Angel* of his *Preſence* ſaved them: viz. *that Angel*, who is the *Face of God*; of whom it is ſaid, *my Face ſhall go before thee:* Laſtly, *that Angel*, of whom the Prophet *Malachi* mentions; and *the* Lord *whom ye ſeek ſhall ſuddenly come to his Temple*; *even the* Angel *of the* Covenant, *whom ye deſire.*" At length he adds; "the *Face* of *God* is *God himſelf*, as all Interpreters do acknowledge. But no one can rightly underſtand this, without being inſtructed in the Myſteries of the Law."

The abſurdity of ſuppoſing the *Angel* of *Jehovah* to be the *Jehovah himſelf*, whoſe Angel he is; I have ſhewn in my Second Letter: but that the *Angel* of *Jehovah* is (himſelf) *Jehovah*, is eaſily explained from the Myſteries of the Law; eſpecially from *Ex.* xxiii. 21, where we are informed, that the *Angel* of *Jehovah* was to bear the Name of *Jehovah*; which is the proper Name of *God:* and ſhews us a ſufficient Reaſon, why the *ſame* Perſon may be alſo called by any *other* Name of *God:* as *El Bethel*, or *El Shaddai*, or *Peniel*. It is manifeſt that the *ſelf-exiſtent Jehovah*, who put his Name on the *Jehovah Angel*; cannot be the *ſame Jehovah*, *on*

whom

whom his Name was put: and it is the confounding theſe Ideas, that crëates all the ſeeming Difficulty. If they be both the ſame, why are they ever diſtinguiſhed as if different: and if they be not the ſame, why are they ever confounded?

Among the Notions of the more Modern *Jews*, we muſt alſo obſerve; that the *Cabbaliſts* believed *El Shaddai* to be the ſame Perſon as the Angel *Metatron*, whom they ſuppoſed to be the Inſtructer of *Moſes*, and the *Meſſiah*; *i. e.* as Dr. *Allix* expreſſes it, he was, according to the *Chriſtian* Phraſe, the *Logos* before his Incarnation; or, according to the *Jewiſh* Phraſe, the *Soul of the Meſſias*; which they look-upon as ſomething between God and the Angels, whom nothing ſeparates from God(*y*).

Biſhop *Pearſon*, in proving by ſeveral Arguments, that *Chriſt* is called *Jehovah*, ſays;

(*y*) *Allix*, 456. *Calmet*, on the word *Metatron*, ſays; Les Hebreux donnent ce Nom au *premier* des Anges; à celui qui les conduiſoit dans le Deſert, et dont il eſt dit dans *Moyſe*, " Je vais envoyer mon Ange, qui marchera devant vous," &c.—Il faiſoit à l'egard des *Iſraelites*, ce que l'Officier nomme *Metator* faiſoit chez les *Romains*. Il marquoit les Campemens, en traçoit la Forme, les Dimenſions, l'Etendue.—On croit que c'eſt l'Archange St. *Michael*; qui etoit à la tête du Peuple, dans le Deſert: que c'eſt lui qui lutta contre *Jacob*, qui eſt appellé *la Face de Dieu*, dans *Exod.* xxxiv. 14. & qui eſt le *Mediateur* entre Dieu & les Hommes: qu'il écrit les bonnes Actions, & en tient un Regiſtre.

" The

"The *Jews* themſelves acknowledge, that *Jehovah* ſhall be known clearly in the days of the *Meſſias*; and not only ſo, but that it is the Name which doth properly belong to him." For the proof of which he quotes the Book *Sepher Ikkarim*; ii. 8. *The Scripture calleth the name of the* Meſſias, Jehovah *our Righteouſneſs:* and *Midraſh Tillim*, on *Pſ.* xxi. *God calleth the* Meſſias *by his own Name; and his Name is* Jehovah: as it is *Ex.* xv. 3. The Lord is a Man of War; *Jehovah* is his Name. And it is written of the *Meſſias*; [*Jer.* xxiii. 6.] *And this is the Name which they ſhall call him*; Jehovah *our Righteouſneſs*. Thus *Echa Rabbati*; [*Lam.* i. 6.] What is the Name of the *Meſſias? R. Abba* ſaid, *Jehovah* is his Name; as it is ſaid, [*Jer.* xxiii. 6.] *And this is the Name which they ſhall call him*; Jehovah *our Righteouſneſs*. The ſame he reports of Rabbi *Levi*. And the Biſhop concludes; "the Rabbins then did acknowledge, that the Name *Jehovah* did belong to the *Meſſias*(z)." And accordingly *Grotius* ſays; the *Meſſias* is called the *Word* of *God*, by the *Chaldee* Paraphraſt; as by *David*, *Iſaias*, and others, he is called by that auguſt Name of God, *Jehovah*; and alſo *Lord:* viz. *Elohim*, and *Adonai*; for ſo he explains himſelf in his Annotations: and adds this Obſervation; that the *Talmud* in *Taanith*

(z) *Pearſon* on the Creed; p. 148.

ſaith,

ſaith, when the time ſhall come, ſpoken-of *Iſaiah* xxv. 8, 9, *Jehovah* ſhall be ſhewn, as it were with the finger: that is; Men ſhall be able to point [or direct] others to him; ſaying, Lo! there is *Jehovah*(*a*).

And this Language, and Interpretation, of the Scripture by the *Chaldee* Paraphraſts, *Philo*, the ancient and modern *Rabbins*, and the Book of the Wiſdom of *Solomon*; is entirely agreeable to the *New Teſtament*, and the Language of the *Apoſtles*; as explained by the moſt ancient Fathers of the *Chriſtian* Church. And Mr. *Pyle*, ſays(*b*); "Whoever will compare the firſt Chapter of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and the beginning of St. *John*'s Goſpel, and other Paſſages of the *New Teſtament*, with the numerous Expreſſions of *Philo Judæus*, concerning the Perſonal Character of him whom they all ſtile the *Word* or *Son* of *God*; will, I think, clearly perceive; that the Evangelic Writers did conform themſelves to the well-known Language and Notion of that Time, in this matter."

And, for a long time after this, the Fathers of the *Chriſtian* Church explained theſe things in the very ſame manner.

Irenæus [who died a Martyr in 202,] ſays; "He *(God)* commanded, and they (all things)

(*a*) *Grot.* de Ver. l. V. c. xxi. and Biſhop *Patrick*'s Preface to the Tranſlation of it. (*b*) on *Heb.* i. 1.

were

were creäted(*c*)—Now to whom did he give Commandment? even to his *Word*, who is our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt*(*d*)." He tells us, in numberleſs places; that the Perſon, who appeared viſibly under the Old Teſtament, and is ſtiled *God* and *Lord*; was not the *ſupreme God*, and Maker of all things; but the *Word*, his *Son*: who miniſtred to the Will of the *One God*, the Father and Maker of all things.

Clemens Alexandrinus [who died in 220,] ſays; "The *Son* is the *ſecond* Cauſe, by whom all things are made according to the Will of the *Father*;" and he repreſents the *Father* as the ſupreme *Lord* of all things, and *Lord* of him who is the ſecond Cauſe(*e*).

Tertullian [who died in 220,] ſays; the *Son* always appeared, and the *Son* always acted, *by the Authority and Will of the Father*; becauſe the *Son* can do nothing of himſelf, but what he ſeeth the *Father* do(*f*). And he from the beginning appeared to the Patriarchs and Prophets—but the *Father* was ſeen by no one—by whoſe Authority and Name, he, the *Son*, appeared and was God(*g*). No other *God* could converſe with Mankind on Earth; except the *Word*, who is about to be made *Fleſh*(*h*).

(*c*) *Pſ.* xxxiii. 9.—II Epiſt. *Pet.* iii. 5.—*Heb.* xi. 3. here it is Ῥήμαϑι. (*d*) *Iren.* lib. III. c. 8. (*e*) *Strom.* Lib. V. p. 598. (*f*) *Adv. Prax.* c. xv. (*g*) *Adv. Mar.* lib. c. xxvii. Reply to Waterland's def. p. 145. (*h*) *Bulli* Op. p. 11.

Origen

Origen [who died in 252,] ſays; "The *immediate Framer* of the Univerſe is the *Son* of *God*; but the *firſt* and *ſupreme God* is his *Father*(*i*)—The unbegotten gave his Command to the firſt-born of every Creature; and all things were creäted(*k*)." He obſerves, that the Term διὰ [*by*] denotes the *ſecond* Cauſe; that all things were made, διὰ τοῦ Λόγου· but not, ὑπὸ τοῦ Λόγου, as the original or *firſt* Cauſe(*l*); but by [ὑπὸ] one who is more excellent and greater than the *Word:* and who can this be, ſays he, but the *Father*(*m*)?

Hippolitus [who died in 230,] ſays; "the *Father gives* Command; and the *Word performs* it. The *Father* made things according to his own Will, and begat the *Word*; Ἐργάτην· the Operator, Workman, or Builder of the things which were made(*n*).

Theophilus, Biſhop of *Antioch*, [who died about 182,] ſtiles the *Word* the *miniſterial Framer* of all things, which were made by God(*o*): and his Words to *Autolycus*, are very remarkable, to this purpoſe. "You will object," ſays he; "that I teach, that God cannot be

(*i*) Con *Celſ.* lib. VI. p. 308. (*k*) Ibid. p. 61. (*l*) St. *Paul* [I *Cor.* viii.] makes a ſimilar diſtinction of ἐξ οὗ, to ſignify the *firſt* Cauſe; and δι' οὗ, to ſignify the *efficient* Cauſe. (*m*) Comment on *John*; p. 55. 56. (*n*) Contr. *Noet.* p. 15. (*o*) Ad *Autol.* p. 81, & 129, 130. *Jackſon*; p. 142.

comprehended in any particular place; how then can I ſay, that *God* walked in Paradiſe? Hear the Anſwer I make to this Objection. The *God* and *Father* of all things is indeed *immenſe*, [ἀχώρητος] and not found in any *place*: [ἐν τόπῳ] But his *Word*, by which he made all things; repreſenting the *Perſon* of the Father, and Lord of all; [ἀναλαμβάνων τὸ πρόσωπο,] came into Paradiſe in the *Perſon of God*, and converſed with *Adam*; who is ſaid to have heard the *Voice* of *God*, which is likewiſe his *Son*. And preſently after, he adds; "The *Word* therefore being *God*, and the *Son* of *God*; the Father of the Univerſe *ſends* him, when it is his will ſo to do, unto any particular *place*; where, when he comes, he is both *heard* and *ſeen*, being *ſent* by the Father; and he is found in that *place*.

This Interpretation is the Key to all the Accounts of *Jehovah*'s Appearance and Converſation with Mankind: which in many places, upon any other Principle, are unintelligible in a *literal* Senſe; and inconſiſtent with a *Viſion*.

The Council of *Antioch*, about the year 213, declared; that *Chriſt* fulfilled the *Father*'s Will, in appearing to the Patriarchs; being ſtiled ſometimes an *Angel*, ſometimes *Lord*, ſometimes *God*. But it is impious, ſay they, to imagine;

imagine; that the *God* of the *Univerſe* is ever called an *Angel*(*p*).

Novatian [who lived about the time of this Council,] ſays; "God the Father, being immenſe, can neither deſcend, nor aſcend; becauſe he is contained in no place, but himſelf contains and fills all things." And that, to ſuppoſe him to deſcend, is to circumſcribe him in a particular place, and to deny his immenſity(*q*), &c. Therefore he argues; that it was the *Word*, the *Son*, that deſcended.

Euſebius [who died in 338,] ſays; "the *Word*, or *Son*, being a *diſtinct Perſon*, was the *Miniſter* of the *Father*; and ſo made all things at the Command of a *Superior*(*r*)—and the *Father*, being *Supreme*, made the Univerſe *by* his *Son*(*s*)." And again; "It is impoſſible that the *ſupreme God*, who is inviſible and unbegotten, and the abſolute King of the Univerſe; ſhould be ſeen by mortal Eyes: who then can that Perſon, that appeared, be; but *God* the *Word*, who is ſtiled *Lord* after the *Father*(*t*)?" And even where he ſtiles the *Son*, *Creator* of the World; he ſtill, at the ſame time, ſays; the "*Father* is ſupreme over all, and the *God* even of this *Creator himſelf*(*u*)."

(*p*) Epiſt. Synod. ad *Paul. Samoſ.* (*q*) *De Trin.* c. xxv. (*r*) Demonſ. Evan. l. V. c. v. p. 229. (*s*) De Eccleſ. Theol. l. I. c. xx. (*t*) Demon. Evan. l. I. p. 11. (*u*) L. iv. c. 5. and Eccleſ. Hiſt. l. i. c. 2. See the chief part of this Chapter in a Note at the end of the Poſtſcript to this Letter.

Hilary [who died 367,] ſays; "The Angel of God ſpake to *Agar:* and he was both *God*, and *Angel* of God; and called an Angel, as being the Angel of the great Counſil; i. e. *Chriſt*; [μεγάλης βουλῆς Ἄγγελος, *Iſ.* vi. 6.] who is called an Angel of God(*x*).

Ambroſe [born in 340,] ſays; "He is called both *Angel* and *God*; that he might not be thought to be He, *of* whom are all things; but He, *by* whom are all things(*y*).

Cyril [who died in 386,] ſays; "When the *Father* willed that all things ſhould be formed, the *Son* formed them by the appointment of the Father; that ſo the original abſolute ſupreme Authority (that is the ſignification of αὐθεντικὴ ἐξουσία) might be reſerved to the *Father*; and at the ſame time the *Son* might have power over the things that He made(*z*)."

But I ſhall make the largeſt Quotations from *Juſtin Martyr*; as being more particularly addreſſed to *our* Nation, in his Dialogue with *Trypho*. "No Man, ſays he, who hath the leaſt ſenſe, will dare to ſay; that the *Maker*, and *Father* of the Univerſe *left* the ſuperceleſtial Manſions, and appeared here in a little part of the Earth(*a*)." Wherefore he argues with

(*x*) *Gal.* iv. 4. *Teniſon* of Idol. 326. (*y*) *Ambr.* tom. X. p. 222. *Teniſon* of Idol. 330. (*z*) *Cyril, Hier.* Cat. ii. Obſervations on Dr. *Waterland*'s ſecond Defence, p. 7. (*a*) Dial. cum *Tryph.* p. 73. ed. *Gr.* 264, *Lond.* ed.

Trypho;

Trypho; "that the *God* who ſpake to *Moſes*, was not the Maker of the Univerſe; but was the ſame Perſon who had appeared to *Abraham*, &c. *miniſtring* to the Will of the Maker of the Univerſe; and who *miniſtred* alſo in like manner to his Will, at the Judgment of the *Sodomites*." He tells him; that "*God* appeared to them with two Angels ſent along with him by *another*, who always abides in the ſuperceleſtial Manſions, and *never* appeared to any; whom, ſays he, we underſtand to be the Maker and Father of the Univerſe(*b*)." Hence he endeavours to convince *Trypho*; that, "beſides the Maker of the Univerſe, there is another, who IS (and in Scripture is called) *Lord God*: who is alſo called an *Angel*; becauſe he carries Meſſages unto Men, according to the Will of the Maker of the Univerſe: beſides whom there is no other God. The Scripture, ſays he, ſpeaks of Two Perſons in number; the One upon Earth, who deſcended to ſee the Cry of the *Sodomites*; the Other in Heaven, who is the Lord of that Lord who was upon Earth; as being his Father, and God, and the *Cauſe* of his Exiſtence; even though he himſelf be potent, and Lord, and God: αἴτιός τι αὐτῷ τῦ εἶναι καὶ δυνάτῳ, καὶ Κυρίῳ, καὶ Θεῷ· the Cauſe that he exiſts and is powerful, and Lord and God. And ſo; when it is ſaid, *Adam* is made as one

(*b*) Dial. cum *Tryph* p. 68.

of

of Us; it denotes *Number*(*c*). And he declares; that this was *Jeſus*, who appeared and converſed with *Moſes* and *Abraham*, and the other Patriarchs; miniſtring to the Will of the Father(*d*)." And he reproves the *Jews*; for imagining it was the *Father* of the Univerſe, who always ſpake to *Moſes*; " when indeed it was the *Son of God*, who is called an Angel or Meſſenger(*e*)."

Again; " when God ſays, *God* went up from *Abraham*; or the *Lord* ſpake unto *Moſes*; and the *Lord* went down to ſee the Tower; &c. do not imagine, that the *unbegotten God* himſelf aſcended, or deſcended: For the unſpeakable Father and Lord of all things, neither goes nor walks any where—but abides in his place, wherever it is—never moving nor being comprehended in any place; no, not even by the whole World. How then ſhould He ſpeak to, or be heard by any One, or appear in a little Corner of the Earth; when the People of Mount *Sinai* were not able to behold the Glory even of *him* who was *ſent* by Him?—Wherefore; neither *Abraham*, nor *Iſaac*, nor *Jacob*, nor any other Man, ever ſaw *Him*; who is the Father and ineffable Lord of all things abſolutely, even of *Chriſt* himſelf: but they ſaw *him*, who *by the Will of the Father* is *God*,

(*c*) Dial. cum *Tryph.* p. 121. *Lond.* edit. p. 413.
(*d*) Ibid. p. 109. (*e*) Apol. ii. p. 161.

as

as being *his Son*; and an Angel, as *miniſtring* to his Will(*f*)." And he gives this Reaſon, why the *Word* is called an *Angel*; to wit, that he may be known to be the *Miniſter* or *Subſtitute* of the Father of all Things(*g*)."

In ſhort, it was the unanimous Opinion of the Ancients; that it was abſurd and impious to ſuppoſe, that the God of the Univerſe *ever appeared*; or was called an Angel: and from hence *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea* concludes; that it was the *Word* of *God*(*h*). And he calls him "the ſecond Cauſe, after the Father of all things; having received from the Father Power and Dominion, and adminiſtring to his Commands.

The Council of *Sermium* [in 349,] declared againſt *Photinus*; who maintained, that *Chriſt* never appeared, till he was born of the Virgin; "Whoſoever ſaith, that the *unbegotten Father* only was ſeen to *Abraham*, and not the *Son*; let him be accurſed(*i*)." And a Curſe was likewiſe denounced by the ſame Council, againſt "all; who confeſs not, that the *Son miniſtred* to the *Father* in the Creation of all things:" and who maintain, that "when *God* ſaid, Let *Us* make Man; the *Father* ſaid it not

(*f*) Dial. cum *Tryph.* p. 101. (*g*) Ibid. p. 72. *Lond.* edit. p. 410, 259. (*h*) Dem. Evang. l. V. c. 9. Eccleſ. Hiſt. p. 3. (*i*) *Socr.* l. II. c. xxx. p. 123. & *Hil. Pict* de Syn. p. 373. *Athan.* de Syn. p. 693. *Teniſon* of Idol. p. 324.

to

to the *Son*, but to *Himſelf*(*k*): and likewiſe againſt thoſe who ſhould maintain, that it was the *unbegotten Father*, and not the *Son*, who ſtrove with *Jacob*(*l*)."

The ſame *Euſebius* juſt mentioned, who was Biſhop in *Paleſtine*; undoubtedly knew the Opinion of the *Jews*, where he lived; and gives us an Account of them ſo late as his own times, in theſe Words(*m*). "The *Jews*, ſays he, after the Eſſence of the all-powerful God, who had neither Beginning nor Origin; place that Head, or Chief, which was *begotten* of the Father, and therefore was his *Firſt-born*: which, as he is the Coadjutor of his Counſil, is therefore called the Image of his Father. Which *Chief*, as he far excells all created Beings, is for that Reaſon called the *Image* of God; the *Wiſdom* of God; the *Logos*, or *Word* of God; the *Prince* of the Lord's *Hoſt*; and the *Angel* of his *Counſil*, or *Covenant*(*n*)."

The whole of this Opinion is taken from the Old Teſtament; and we ſee by it, that the belief of the *Jews* and *Chriſtians*, upon this Subject, was very much alike, for the three firſt Centuries of the *Chriſtian* Æra: and indeed it could not well be otherwiſe; while they both

(*k*) *Teniſon*; p. 319. (*l*) Symb. *Sirm.* apud *Hil.* de *Syn.* p. 373. & *Socr.* Eccleſ. Hiſt. l. II. c. xxx. p. 123. *Teniſon* of Idol. p. 327. (*m*) Præpar. Evang. l. VIII. c. 15. (*n*) Biſhop *Clayton* on Spirit; p. 41.

derived

derived their Faith from the ſame Scripture. But when Grandeur, and Riches, and Power, were brought into the *Chriſtian* Church; and ambitious Men made their Court to Emperors, by eſpouſing different Sects and Parties; when the Practical Spirit of Chriſtianity was changed for Metaphyſical Theories; and Orthodoxy of Opinion was fixed by Majority of Voices; and Chriſtian Charity was blinded by an ignorant and furious Zeal; the Studying of the Scriptures became not only uſeleſs, but dangerous. Truth gave way to Authority; and the very knowledge of *Chriſt*'s Perſon was loſt in Myſtery. Sometimes he *was*, and ſometimes he *was not*, the Angel of the Covenant: and when he *was*, then the *Angel* of *God* was ſuppoſed to be equal to *God* himſelf; the *Son* equal to the *Father*; the *Meſſiah*, who was ſent by God to do his Will, equal to the *God*, who ſent him, and rewarded him for his Obedience: the *infinite* Subſtance to be *circumſcribed* by a human Body; the *impaſſible* Subſtance to be *crucified*; and the *ſupreme God*, under the name of the *Son*, to *ſuffer*; in order to ſatisfy *Himſelf*, under the name of the *Father*. And the ancient Faith of the Church was almoſt entirely loſt.

If it be aſked, in what Condition *our own* Religion then was; and whether it was not capable of giving great Light to the *Chriſtians*, and leading them out of this Labyrinth, in

which they were involved? it must be answered, it was not.—For when our Fathers found the Arguments, which the Christians used from their Scriptures, to prove that the *Messiah was come*; pressed hard upon their Opinions, which they could not fairly defend; and the Interpretations and Comments of their ancient Rabbins favoured the *Christian* Faith; they acted with the same Heat, and inconsiderate Zeal against the *Christians*, as the different Sects of the *Christians* did against one another; and by giving new, forced, and unnatural Interpretations to the Texts of Scripture which appeared to make against them, have so confounded themselves; that at present they scarcely know what they believe: and finding all attempts in vain, to answer the *Christians*; they seem at last to have acquiesced in looking upon their Prophecies of the *Messiah*, as a *Mystery* not to be enquired into: and to rest in a System of *Quietism*, which has shut out all farther Improvement, and even Curiosity in Religious Studies.(*o*).

(*o*) Profecto qui dies illis candidam Libertatis lucem abstulit, Imperiumque de eorum excussit manibus; ille idem ingenuos quoque spiritus eorum perdomuit, nihil ut amplius habeant vividi vigoris. Ut *Eumæus Ulyssi* illud divine ait;

Ἥμισυ τῆς ἀρέτης ἀποαίνυται εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
Ἀνέρος, εὖτ' ἂν μιν καλὰ δέλιον ἦμαρ ἕλησι.

Cunæus; p. 115.

But

But notwithſtanding the palpable Darkneſs, which overſpread the face of Literature for many Ages; and gave an opportunity of introducing Tranſubſtantiation, the Worſhip of the Dead, and a new Explication of the Trinity, contrary to the Scriptures and the ancient Fathers; whereby this Doctrine, that *Chriſt* was the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, was a long time loſt; and the *Chriſtian* Church was divided upon the Queſtion, *who* and what he was; whether a *Man*, or an *Angel*, or the ſupreme *God*, or only a *mode of Exiſtence* under which the ſupreme God appeared, &c. yet at the revival of Learning, upon the Reformation made by the Proteſtants, ſuch ſtrong proofs were found in the Scriptures, from the Texts I have produced and many others, for the Truth of this Doctrine; and ſuch great and abundant Authority from the Writings of the Ancients, both *Jews* and *Chriſtians*; that the moſt famous and valuable of the *Chriſtian* Commentators have been obliged by mere force of Truth and Evidence, to acknowledge it to be the ſenſe of the Scripture, in many Texts which were incapable of Explanation upon any other Principle.

I ſhall quote a few Authors, to prove this; as they now lie before me.

Dr. *Allix*'s Book of the Judgment of the *Jewiſh* Church, is wholly written to prove this Doctrine to be the Doctrine of that Church. And

Bp. *Bull* has fully proved it to be the Doctrine of the ancient *Chriſtian* Fathers.

Poole, in his Annotations on *Gen.* xlviii. 16. where the Redeeming Angel is ſpoken of, ſays; "Surely [this was] not a *creäted Angel*; but *Jeſus Chriſt*, who is called an *Angel*; *Ex.* xxiii. 20. and the *Angel of the Covenant*; *Mal.* iii. 1." And *Pyle*, in his Paraphraſe on the *Pentateuch*, tells us; that the *Redeeming Angel* means *Jeſus Chriſt*, the *Angel* of the *Covenant*. And the *Dutch* Annotations, printed by authority of the Synod of *Dort* in 1618, and publiſhed by authority in 1637, ſay; "this cannot be a *creäted Angel*, but muſt be the *Son* of *God*." And, on *Iſ.* lxiii. 9. the *Angel* of the *Preſence* ſaved them; the *Dutch* Annotators ſay, "the *Angel* of his *Face*:" that is, the Angel that is before his *Face*, that taketh care of their Salvation; to wit, *Chriſt*. So alſo on *Ex.* xxiii. 20. And *Poole* tells us, that "the *Angel* of the *Preſence* is the ſame that conducted the *Iſraelites* through the Wilderneſs; called an *Angel*, *Ex.* xxxii. 2. and his *Preſence*, ver. 14. and *Jehovah*, *Ex.* xiii. 21. ſo that it muſt be the ſame as the Lord *Jeſus Chriſt*; as *Stephen* doth interpret it, *Acts* vii. 35." *Calvin* ſays; *poteſt de* Chriſto *exponi*: and *Calovius* ſays; Meſſiam *hic intelligi multa docent*: and gives ſeveral Reaſons, why it muſt be ſo underſtood; which are very concluſive(*p*).

(*p*) *Poole*'s Synopſis on Iſ. lxiii. 9.

And

And on *Ex.* iii. 2. where mention is made of the Angel that appeared in the Buſh; the *Synopſis* ſays, this was *Chriſt*; *nempe Angelus magni Conſilii*; ſo ſay *Vatablus*, *Caſtalio*, *Clarius*, *Junius*, *Piſcator*, from the *Rabbins*. So alſo *Theodoret*, *Ambroſe*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Juſtin*, *Tertullian*, *Hilary*.

And again; *Calvin* on *Zech.* ii. 10. ſays; "Hence it is plain (becauſe this *Jehovah* was "to appear conſpicuouſly and bodily) that this "expreſſion cannot be perverted to ſignify the "prophet; nor can it agree with *God the Father*, "*Chriſt* therefore ſpeaks here not as a *Man*, or an "*Angel*, but as *Jehovah*; by which name he is "here called, and as *God* the *Redeemer*."

Now from hence I argue; that if *Chriſt* be that *Jehovah*, who is viſible; he can be no other Perſon than the *Angel* of the *Covenant*: and if he be *once* ſo, he muſt be ſo *always*. For though he ſupported the *Perſon* and *Character* of the ſupreme *Jehovah*, but was not the ſupreme *Jehovah himſelf*; yet we are never told, that he ſupported the Character of the *Angel* of the *Covenant*: and therefore if he *ever* ſpeaks in *his* Name, he muſt be the very identical Perſon; and ought to be underſtood as ſuch, through the whole Revelation: and the *Chriſtians* have no Authority from Scripture to ſuppoſe, that He takes up and lays down this Character, juſt as *they* pleaſe; *arbitrio popularis auræ*.

See

See alſo the learned Mr. *Ainſworth*, on the above Texts; who tells us, "that this Angel was *Chriſt*; on *Ex.* iii. 2 and on *Gen.* xlviii. 16. *Chriſt*, the *Angel* of the *Covenant*."

Archbiſhop *Teniſon* ſays; "the Son was that Angel of God, who ſtrove with and bleſſed the Patriarch *Jacob*: hence *Jacob*, in grateful memory of that bleſſing, called the place *Peniel*; having there ſeen the *Face*, that is, the *Shechinah* or *Image* of *God*; perſonated by the *Logos*, his *Son*(q)." And again; "by the Son the Father *made* the World; and what if I ſay he *governed* it alſo; as by *his Logos* or *Word*? For in God we do not diſtinctly apprehend his way of working; but conceive it under the more general notion of *Will* or *Command*. If I declare, the *Son* always acted in the *Father's Name*; I make but the ſame Profeſſion, which *Tertullian* did many ages ago;" &c.

Bp. *Pearſon* quotes *Hoſea* i. 7. where God ſays, I will have mercy upon the houſe of *Judah*, and will ſave them by *Jehovah* their God: and obſerves, that the *efficient* Cauſe of Salvation is here called *Jehovah*, as well as the *original* Cauſe: and this, he ſays, can be no other than *Jeſus Chriſt*(r). And, on *Zech.* x. 12. he makes the ſame Obſervation: what other *Lord*, [that is *Jehovah*] can we conceive to dwell in the midſt

(q) *Teniſon* on Idol. 327.
(r) *Pearſon* on the Creed; 148.

of

of us, and to be *ſent* unto us by the *Lord* [*Jehovah*] of Hoſts; but *Chriſt*(*s*)?

Biſhop *Bull* ſays; "the Fathers of the firſt ages generally teach, that the *Son* of *God* frequently appeared to holy Men, under the Old Teſtament. Nay, all thoſe appearances, wherein the Name *Jehovah* and divine honours are given to the Perſon that appeared; (notwithſtanding that perhaps he be alſo called an *Angel*) are underſtood by them, as belonging to the *Son* of *God*. He that knows not this, is a ſtranger in the Writings of the Fathers(*t*)." And again; "wherever it was not a *mere Angel*, but *God himſelf* that appeared; there, according to the unanimous Opinion of all primitive Antiquity, we conſtantly affirm; that it was not the *Father*, but the *Son*(*u*)."

Biſhop *Burnet* ſays; the Fathers for the moſt part had a Notion very frequent in their Writings, till St. *Auguſtine*'s time, [about the year 400.] who did confute it, and obliged them by whom it was received, to reject it: which is; that the *Father alone* being of himſelf *inviſible*, apparitions of *God*, made in the Old Teſtament, muſt be referred only to the *Logos*; as to him, whom the *Father* had not only employed as a Miniſter in the *Creation*, but by whom alſo he always revealed himſelf under the *Old Teſtament*

(*s*) *Pearſon* on the Creed, p. 149.
(*t*) S. I. c. i. § 2. See *Clarke*'s Scrip. Doctr. n. 616.
(*u*) Sect. iv. c. iii. § 15. p. 78.

—And

—And the foundation of this Opinion, he ſays, is more ſolid, than Mr. *Hill* is aware of; almoſt all the Ancients prove the Divinity of *Jeſus Chriſt*, becauſe it was He, who appeared under the Old Teſtament; and that He, who then appeared, is named *Jehovah*, which the LXX render Κύριος. And he ſays; it is St. *Paul*'s Doctrine, that the *Logos* is *Jehovah*; and that the *Jehovah* incarnate is no leſs *Jehovah*, than he was before the Incarnation. If it were otherwiſe; St. *Paul* had argued like a Sophiſter, when he proves, by a Paſſage out of *Joel*, that Salvation belongs to *Chriſtians*; becauſe they invoke *Jeſus Chriſt*, who is ſpoken-of by *Joel*(*x*).

Dr. *Samuel Clarke*, in his *Scripture Doctrine*, ſays; "it is the unanimous Opinion of all Antiquity, that this *Angel*, who ſaid, I am the *God* of thy Fathers, was *Chriſt*, the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, (the *Angel* of *God's Preſence*, and in whom the Name of *God* was;) ſpeaking in the Name and Perſon of the Inviſible *Father*(*y*).

The Author of the Reply to Dr *Waterland*'s Defence of his Queries, ſays; "the *Son* was the *God*, not *of* or *from* whom, but *by* or *through* whom all things were: the *Word*; the viſible Perſon; the *Shechinah* or *viſible* Repreſentation of the *inviſible God*; who, from the beginning appeared in the Old Teſtament, under the Title

(*x*) *Animad.* on Mr. *Hill*'s Book, p. 18, &c.

(*y*) No. 619, 579, 359, 916, 69, 491. See theſe places.

of

of *God*, the *Angel of the Lord*; who in the fulneſs of time was made Fleſh; and came unto *his own*, [either to Mankind in general; or to the People of the *Jews*, whom he had all along conducted in a peculiar manner;] and was rejected by them; and humbled himſelf unto death of the Croſs, and roſe again, and was highly exalted to the right hand of God, and had then all power given him, both in Heaven, and in Earth(*z*). 'Tis remarkable; that the Deſcriptions of the *Word*, in the Old Teſtament, always repreſent him as the *Angel* or *Meſſenger* of God's Will; and that he is never, in his *own* Perſon, ſaid to have a *Throne* or *Kingdom*; but in the Prophecies of his coming in the *Fleſh*. Thus in *Daniel*, I ſaw in the Night Viſions, and behold one like the *Son* of *Man*(*a*), &c. and thus *Iſaiah* likewiſe foretold; Unto us a Child is born, &c(*b*). and that the ſame Perſon, who had been in the Form of *God*; as being the *Shechinah*, or viſible Repreſentation of *God*'s inviſible Glory; and the Declarer and Executer of his Will, under the Old Teſtament; did receive that Dominion and Power of Judgement, with which he is now inveſted; and was made Heir and Judge of all, after his Reſurrection from the dead; is declared by St. *Paul*(*c*): who tells the

(*z*) Reply to Dr. *Waterland*, p. 229, 230. (*a*) *Dan.* vii. 13, 14. (*b*) *Iſ.* ix. 6. (*c*) *Phil.* ii. 6, 7, &

Philippians, that being in the Form of God, he did not claim to be [honoured] as God, οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο; but emptied himſelf of that glorious Form, and took upon him the Form of a Servant(*d*)," &c.

Dr. *Sykes*, ſays(*e*); " it ſeems to be as univerſally received an Opinion, as any among the *Chriſtian* Writers; that the *Son* of *God* was the *Angel* of the *Covenant*; was the *Angel* that appeared to *Abraham*, and to *Moſes*, and to others.

Laſtly; Mr. *Lowth*(*f*) ſays: " The *Angel*, " who conducted them by the Pillar of Cloud, " and of Fire, was no other than the *Logos*, or " ſecond Perſon of the bleſſed Trinity, ac- " cording to the ſenſe of the ancient *Jews*; as " Dr. *Allix* hath proved at large, in his Judge- " ment of the *Jewiſh* Church, againſt the *Uni-* " *tarians*(*g*). This divine Perſon is ſometimes " indeed

(*d*) Reply to Dr. Waterland, p. 230, 231. (*e*) On *Heb.* ii. 2. (*f*) *Iſ.* lxiii. 8. (*g*) *Allix*, ch. xiii, xiv, xv. To the Authorities mentioned by Biſhop *Bull*, Letter I. Note xiv. add, from Dr. *Allix*, *Clem. Alex.* Pæd. 1, 7. *Origen* in *Iſa.* vi. *Cyprian* con. *Jud.* ii. 5. Conſtitut. Apoſ. v. 21. *Cyril Hieroſ.* Cat. xii. The Council of *Sirmium*, c. xiii. *Greg. Bat.* tr. de Fide *Theod.* Q. 5. in *Exod.* &c. *Chryſoſtom* frequently builds upon it; and teaches, that *Chriſt* therefore *gave* the Law; that he might have Authority, when it was convenient to *abrogate* it. See *Teniſon* on Idolatry; p. 332. And *Chryſoſt.* Hom. 66. in *Gen.* vii. where he aſſerts, that the *Elohim*,

" indeed called an *Angel*; as *Ex.* xiv. 9. but at " other times the incommunicable Name of *Je-* " *hovah* is given to him. So [*Ex.* xiii. 21.] it " is ſaid expreſsly; that the *Lord* [*Jehovah*] " went before the people in a pillar of Cloud " by Day, and of Fire by Night. Compare " *Ex.* xiv. 21.—In the ſame Book, *God* ſaith " of him; that His *Name* is in him: *i. e.* His " *Godhead.* [xxiii. 21.] Again; he is called " God's *Preſence*; [*Ex.* xxxiii. 18.] an Ex- " preſſion parallel to that of the Text. So, " [*Deut.* iv. 37.] we read; God choſe their " Seed after them, and brought them out by " his *Preſence*; for ſo the Word *Bepanau* ſigni- " fies. But our Tranſlaters have made no " ſenſe at all of the place by rendering it " and " brought thee out *in his Sight.*" God, to ſhew " his Anger for the Sin of the Golden Calf, " threatens the People that he would not lead " them himſelf; but only ſend his Angel with " them: [*Ex.* xxxiii. 2, 3.] At this the Peo- " ple were very much diſpleaſed; [ver. 4.] " and *Moſes* earneſtly intercedes with *God*, that " the divine *Preſence* might ſtill accompany " them: [ver. 15.] that is, that *God* would " continue to go before them, in the Pillar of " Cloud and Fire. According to this Inter-

Elohim, in *Gen.* xlviii. 15. was the Eternal Son of God. See the Authorities quoted from Biſhop *Bull*; Letter I. Note XV.

" pretation, St. *Paul* ſaith; that the *Jews*
" tempted *Chriſt* in the Wilderneſs; [I *Cor.* x.
" 9.] meaning, the *Logos*; who, after his
" aſſuming human Nature, was *Chriſt*.—When
" the Tabernacle was ſet-up, this *Shechinah*, or
" token of *God's Preſence*, took-up his Reſi-
" dence over the Ark; [*Numb.* vii. 89.] and
" the Cloud covered the Top of the Taberna-
" cle. [xi. 34, 38.] And then the *Lord* is
" ſaid to come-down in the Pillar of a Cloud;
" and ſolemn Adoration is paid to him, when
" this Symbol of the divine Preſence appeared.
" *Ex.* xxxiii. 10. *Numb.* xvi. 19, 22. All
" theſe Circumſtances laid together, prove;
" that the *Perſon*, who led the People through
" the Wilderneſs, could be no *crëated* Being;
" though he is ſometimes called an *Angel*, be-
" cauſe he took upon him the Office and Mi-
" niſtry of *Angels*; as he afterwards took upon
" him the Form of a *Servant*. But in the Text
" he is ſtiled, in a diſtinguiſhing manner, the
" *Angel* of *God's Preſence*; and, [in *Malachi*
" iii. 1.] the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, for ſo the
" Words ſhould be tranſlated." And [on *Iſ.*
vi. 1.] Mr. *Lowth* explains the *Lord*, to be
" the divine *Shechinah*; or the *Glory* of the
" *Lord*, as St. *John* explains it; [xii. 41.] who
" alſo aſſures us; that it was the *Logos*, or *ſe-*
" *cond Perſon* of the bleſſed Trinity: this Viſion
" having a particular Relation to the times of
" the Goſpel. [ver. 9, 10.] It was the una-
" nimous

"nimous ſenſe of the ancient Church; that "all the divine Appearances, in the Old Teſta-"ment, were made by the *Son* of *God*; by "whom all the Affairs of the Church were or-"dered from the Beginning. See this proved, "from the New Teſtament and the Fathers, "by Biſhop *Bull*; *Def. Fid. Nic.* c. 1. ſect. 1."

By all this you ſee; that *We*, as well as the *Mahometans*, have been too haſty; in accuſing the *Chriſtian* Religion as Idolatrous, and charging the *Chriſtians* in general with Idolatry; becauſe they worſhip *Chriſt*: as if the worſhip paid to the *Angel* of *God*, or the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, was the worſhip of another *God*. I allow; that, if they ſuppoſed the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, to be the *ſupreme God* and Governor of the Univerſe, and *equal* to *Jehovah*, in whoſe *Name* he acts, and whoſe *Miniſter* he is; and worſhipped him *ultimately*, as God of the Univerſe; this would be *Idolatry*, in the ſtrict and proper ſenſe of the Word: but this is only the opinion of the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians*; and loſes ground daily among Men of Senſe; being neither founded on Scripture nor Reaſon, nor one ſingle Authority from the Fathers of the three firſt Centuries. *Non duos Deos introduxit* Chriſtus; *quia non duos* æquales, *non* pares, *æquatione in utroque oſtenſa, poſuit. Id enim ſi feciſſet, merito duorum Deorum controverſiam ſuſcitaſſet*; ſays *Novatian*, cap. xxxi. And it appears; that the worſhip of *Chriſt* is of the ſame Nature,

Nature, with that which was paid by the Patriarchs to the ſame Perſon: *i. e.* the viſible Angel who appeared to them. And *Abraham*, when he built an Altar to *Jehovah* that appeared to him in the Plains of *Moreh*; [*Gen.* xii. 7.] and *Jacob*, when he was commanded to build an Altar to *Jehovah*, that appeared to him when he fled from *Eſau*; [xxxv. i.] could have no Notion, that he was the *ſupreme God*; for they knew him to be the *Angel* and *Miniſter* of the *ſupreme God*, as I have already ſhewn: and therefore, if theſe Altars were built for *Worſhip*, and not merely for *Memorials*; the Worſhip paid the *Angel* of the *Covenant* at *theſe*, as well as at *other* times, was the ſame with that of the *Chriſtians* at *preſent*: that is; it was *mediate*, and *ſubordinate*, and *ultimately* directed to the Glory of the *Father*.

And here, I muſt own; our Brethren ſeem rather to have *cut* the Knot, than to have *untied* it. For both *Abraham* and *Jacob* were commanded by *God* to build their Altars particularly to the *Jehovah that appeared* to them; and therefore it was to the Angel himſelf. And *Jacob*'s was a direct Prayer to the Angel: [*Gen.* xlviii. 16.] and *Joſhua* actually worſhipped the *Lord* that *appeared* to him.

It does not therefore ſeem ſufficient to deny the Fact; and ſay, as ſome of our Maſters teach

teach us(*b*), that the Prayers were not directed to the *Angel*; but to the *ſupreme God:* but rather to account for the propriety of ſuch a worſhip of the Angel, conſiſtently with the worſhip of the One ſupreme God: which others of our Maſters have attempted.

But as this Objection of Polytheiſm and Idolatry is a very ancient one; and is fully anſwered by the Primitive *Chriſtians*; I ſhall here avail myſelf of their Defenſes, by giving you a few Quotations from their Writings; as follows.

(*b*) Ubicunque autem reperitur Invocatio ad Angelum, ibi intenditur Precatio ad Deum; qui miſit Angelum ſuum Legatum, ad expediendum iſtud Negotium. Quod autem legitur, *Joſuam* incurvaſſe ſe coram *Angelo*; poſſumus dicere, quod incurvaverit ſe coram *Deo*. *Abrabanel*, de *Capite Fidei*, p. 43, allows; that *Joſhua* proſtrated himſelf before the Angel, ad exequendum ejus mandatum; per modum inferioris: ut coram eo humiliaret ſe qui major erat illo. Non autem oportet difficultatem in eo movere, quod *Jacob* adoraverit *Angelum*; cum ait, *Angelus qui liberavit me*; [*Gen.* xlviii. 16.] eſt enim Precatio ad Deum: quemadmodum cum dicit, *Patres mei ambulaverunt coram Deo qui gubernat me:* & Angelus miſſus eſt ex providentia ad liberandum eum; atque ideo ait, *Angelus liberavit me ex omni malo*. But *Jonathan*, the *Jewiſh* Paraphraſt, and other Writers after him, do commonly term this Bleſſing, in *Gen.* xlviii. a Prayer: and for this reaſon, *R. Menaſſah* thought it neceſſary to endeavour to reconcile this Prayer of *Jacob* with the firſt Commandment; which forbids the Worſhip of *Angels*, according to the *Jews'* Interpretation. *R. Menach.* de *Rek.* in *Pent.* f. 97. c. iv. *Allix*, p. 450.

Juſtin

Juſtin Martyr ſays, in his Dialogue with *Trypho*; he who, being endued with a pious diſpoſition, loves *God* with all his Heart, and all his Strength; will worſhip no *other God*: yet he will worſhip alſo the *Meſſenger* of *God*, *Chriſt*, the Angel of his Preſence; it being God's *Will*, or the *Command* of God, that he ſhould do ſo(*i*).

Origen ſays; we demand of *Celſus*, concerning thoſe whom they worſhip as *Gods*, a proof of the *ſupreme God*'s having appointed them to be worſhipped: and if, on the other hand, he demanded the ſame thing of us, concerning *Jeſus*; we will ſhew him, that *God* hath appointed Him to be worſhipped; that all Men ſhould honour the *Son*, even as they honour the *Father*(*k*).

And *Cyprian* ſays; God the *Father* commanded the *Son* to be worſhipped: which he proves from *Ph.* ii. 9, 10, 11(*l*).

Hippolytus ſays of *Chriſt*; "*He* hath dominion over all things, as the *Father* over Him; that in all things it may appear there is *One* God, to whom *all* things are *ſubject*, even *Chriſt* himſelf; under whom the *Father* hath put all things, Himſelf only excepted.

The Apoſtolic Conſtitutions repreſent it as a branch of the *Gnoſtic* Hereſy, to affirm, that

(*i*) Dial. cum *Tryph.* p. 97. edit. Steph. (*k*) Con. *Celſ.* l. viii. p. 384. (*l*) *De bono Patientiæ.* Reply to *Waterland*'s defence, p. 388.

Jeſus

Jeſus is the *ſupreme God* over all: making himſelf, conſequently, to be his own Father.

Euſebius wrote a Book againſt *Marcellus*; by order of the Council of *Conſtantinople*, [held in 336;] in which he ſolemnly declares, that he would give no private Sentiment of his *own*; but the pure Doctrine of the *Church*: [nihil ſibi proprium nullumve Sapientiæ ſuæ inventum ſe in medium adducturum eſſe; τῆς δὲ ἐκκλησίας τὸ θεῖον ἀδιάφθορον διδασκαλίαν· quam a teſtibus auritis & oculatis olim accepit.] And he aſſerts frequently; that the *Son* of *God* is not the *ſupreme* God(*m*). And he lays it down for the conſtant known Doctrine of the Church; that *Chriſt* himſelf is not the *ſupreme God*; [ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός·] and affirms; "he cannot be a pious perſon, who ſays the *Son* is the *ſupreme God*(*n*):" and adds, that *Sabellius* was excommunicated for this very Aſſertion(*o*); and that he is θεὸς, but not ὁ πρῶτος θεος. And that the Church does not introduce *two* unbegotten, nor *two* unoriginated Beings, nor *two* Subſtances equal and coördinate to each other; and therefore not *two* Gods. And it is remarkable; that the *Antenicenes* never defend the Unity; by ſaying the *Father* and *Son* were *one* by Unity of Subſtance: but only by ſaying, there were not *two* Gods; becauſe the *Son* was not *ſupreme*

(*m*) *Whitby*'s Diſq. Mod. p. 182. (*n*) Euſeb. de Eccleſ. Theol. l. I. c. vii. (*o*) Lib. II. c. iv.

God, nor of *equal* Power with the *Father*; but different in Eſſence: Inferior to the *Father*; ſubject to Him; obedient to Him; miniſtring to Him in all things, even before his Incarnation(*p*).

Again; there being but *one* Original, ſays *Euſebius*, and *one* Head, how can there be *two* Gods? Is not He alone the one God, who has no *Superior*, no *Cauſe* of his Exiſtence; but poſſeſſeth of Himſelf an unoriginated and unbegotten monarchical Power and Divinity; and communicates to the *Son*, of his Divinity and Life: and whom he [the *Son*] teacheth to eſteem the *only true* God, and confeſſeth to be, greater than *himſelf*(*q*)? And again; it is not neceſſary that he, who ſuppoſes two diſtinct Beings, ſhould make two *Gods:* for we do not ſuppoſe the two to be equal in Honour, nor that they are both of them unoriginate, or unbegotten(*r*).

Tertullian ſays; *He* principally hath the Government, by whom it is communicated to the *Son*; and ſo long as it is *His*, it is ſtill a *Monarchy:* and the Monarchy can no more be divided or deſtroyed, by being adminiſtred by the *Son*; (to whom it is given by the *Father*, and who does nothing but by the Will of the

(*p*) *Whitby*'s Diſquiſ. Modeſt. p. 182. (*q*) Demonſ. Evang. p. 227. (*r*) Eccleſ. Theol. lib. II. c. 7.

Fa-

Father;) than if it had been adminiſtred by a Legion of *Angels*(*s*).

Lactantius ſays; "the *Son* of *God* taught, that there is but *one* God; and that He only ought to be worſhipped. Nor did he ever call himſelf God: for he would not have been found faithful; if when he was ſent to take away the *many* Gods, and to declare the *One*, he had introduced any other beſides the *One*. For this would not have been preaching the *One* God, nor doing the Work of *Him* that ſent him; but his *own* Work: and would have been a ſeparating of himſelf, from Him whom he came to make known—Wherefore, becauſe he was ſo faithful, and aſſumed nothing to *himſelf*, but only fulfilled the Commands of *Him* that ſent him; he was inveſted with the Dignity of an everlaſting High-Prieſt, the Honour of a ſupreme King, the Power of a Judge, and the Name and Title of God(*t*)."

And *Origen* ſolves the Objection, in the following manner: "My Anſwer to theſe is; that the *ſelf-exiſtent* God is *that* God. Therefore our Saviour ſays, in his Prayer to the *Father*; that they may know *thee*, the only true *God*. But whatever is God, beſides that *ſelf-exiſtent* Perſon, being ſo by communication of His Divini-

(*s*) Adv. *Prax.* c. iii, iv.

(*t*) Lact. l. IV. c. xiv. Reply to Dr. Waterland's defence, p. 389.

ty, is not *God* abſolutely; but is more properly called a *divine Perſon*: οὐχ ὁ Θεὸς, ἀλλὰ Θεὸς· and therefore he calls the Divinity of *Chriſt*, the *Image* of the *true* Divinity(*u*).

And *Baſil*; to the Queſtion, but how then, if there be two diſtinct Perſons in the *Godhead*, do we not make *two* Gods? anſwers, as I have juſt obſerved; why juſt as a *King*, and the *Deputy* of a King, do not make *two* Kings. ὅτι Βασιλεὺς λέγεται καὶ ἡ τοῦ Βασιλέως εἰκών· οὐ δύο Βασιλεῖς (*x*). Here the *Godhead* can only mean *Dominion*; and this is the medium that *Phil. a Limborch* uſes, to prove that *Chriſt* is *God*; becauſe he reigns in Heaven: *Si* Chriſtianus *oſtenderit* Chriſtum *vere in Cælo regnare*; *tum probavit* Chriſtum *eſſe* Deum(*y*). Accordingly *Novatian* ſays; *God* the *Father* is, without Contradiction, the *God* of all; and the very Principle of his *Son*, whom he made *Lord*: but the *Son* is the *God* of all *Creatures*; becauſe *God* the *Father* hath ſet him at their Head, when He made him *Lord*(*z*). And *Hippolytus* alſo ſays; *Chriſt* is *God* over all, becauſe *God* the *Father* hath delivered all things into his hand(*a*).

(*u*) *Origen* on *John*, p. 46, 47. (*x*) *Baſil.* de Spir. Sanct. c. xviii. Eſſay on Spirit, p. 92. (*y*) Amic. Col. Edit. *Baſil.* p. 380. (*z*) *Novat.* de Trin. cap. ult. (*a*) Cont. *Noet.* p. 10. *Whitby*'s laſt Thoughts, p. 80.

The

The learned Dr. *Whitby* ſpeaks in the ſame manner with *Limborch*; and ſays—Our bleſſed Lord, having a true Dominion over all things in Heaven and Earth, muſt be *truly* God. And that this Dominion is given and committed to him by the *Father*, doth not render him leſs *truly God*; becauſe the word God being a relative Term, it is not the *metaphyſical* Nature, but the *Exerciſe* of *Dominion*, that conſtitutes him a *God* to *us*. And this Dominion he abſcribeth to himſelf in theſe Words: *the* Father *judgeth no* Man, &c(*b*). And hence infers; "that all Men ſhould honour the *Son*, even as they honour the *Father* that ſent him."

Our Saviour may therefore be called *God*; firſt, on account of his divine Excellencies; for which reaſon moſt of the *Antenicene* Fathers ſay, that he is εἰκὼν τῆς πατρικῆς θεότητος, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο θεός· the Image of the Father's *Deity*, and therefore *God*: and ſecondly, becauſe he hath Dominion over all things(*c*).

To theſe Quotations, I ſhall add the following Remarks on the Words quoted by *Origen*. That, when *Chriſt* addreſſed himſelf in Prayer to *God* the *Father*, calling him the *only true* God; he certainly excluded himſelf from being the *only true* God. For he could never have prayed to the *Father* in theſe Words; "that they may

(*b*) Whitby's laſt Thoughts, p. 80. *John* v. 22.
(*c*) *Ib.* p. 25.

know

know Thee, the *only true* God (*d*): if He had been *the only true* God himſelf; either in whole, or in part. The Word *Thee*, being *perſonal*, plainly determines the *Perſon* of the *Father* to be the *only true* God; not only in oppoſition to all other *Subſtance*, but to all other *Perſons* alſo: and, as *all other* Perſons are hereby excluded in *general*; ſo, by the Words immediately ſubjoined, the *Son* is excluded in *particular*; [that they may know Thee, the *only true* God; and *Jeſus Chriſt*, whom thou haſt ſent.] Now nothing can be more plain; than that *two* Perſons are here ſpoken-of: One Perſon is the *only true* God, and the Other *Jeſus Chriſt*; whom the *only true* God hath ſent. Hence therefore it appears that the *Perſon* of the *Father* is the *only true* God, by the expreſs words of *Chriſt* himſelf; and that he excludes himſelf from that Title: whatever may have been ſince erroneouſly admitted, as the *Chriſtian* Doctrine, by any of his miſtaken Followers. And "therefore, ſuppoſing there may be *ſome* in the multitude of Believers, as *Origen* ſays, who raſhly affirm Our Saviour to be the *ſupreme* God; yet *We* affirm no ſuch thing: but believe him who hath ſaid, "My *Father* is *greater* than I."

It is very remarkable; that the Title of the only *true* God, which *Chriſt* has here appropri-

(*d*) *John* xvii. 3.

ated

ated to the *Father*; is never given to *Chriſt*, even by the *Poſt-Nicene* Fathers: and the Reaſon ſeems to be; that their underſtanding revolted at ſo ſtrong and unwarranted an Expreſſion: which recalls to my Mind, how *Our* Diſpute ended with the Popiſh Prieſts at *Marſeilles*; by the imprudent behaviour of our Friend *Khaled*. For *They* no ſooner mentioned *Mary*, the Mother of *God*; but he roſe up in a great heat, ſwearing by *Mahomet*, that *God* was neither *born* nor *died*, and had neither *Son* nor *Daughter*; and that all ſuch as pretended to make their *God*, were more impudent Conjurers than *Jannes* and *Jambres*, who oppoſed *Moſes*. I mention this, for the ſake of obſerving; that, as the *Fathers* feared to call *Chriſt* by the Name of the *only true* God; ſo the *Proteſtants*, even thoſe who call themſelves *Athanaſians*, are afraid to call the Mother of *Jeſus Chriſt*, the Mother of *God*: which plainly proves; that all ſuch, as refuſe theſe Titles to St. *Mary* and to *Chriſt*, out of Conſcience, have two different ſenſes to the Word *God*; whatever they pretend to the contrary: *One*, when they ſpeak of the inviſible *Jehovah*; and *an Other*, when they ſpeak of *Chriſt*: otherwiſe they could not refuſe to call *Mary* the Mother of *God*; and *Chriſt* the only true *God*: For by all the Logic in the World, if She be the *Mother* of *Chriſt*, and *Chriſt* be *God*; She is the *Mother* of God, in the ſame

ſenſe

ſenſe in which he is called *God*: and if he be the *only true* God; then She is the *Mother* of the *only true* God.

But, after all; the Errors of the *Chriſtians*, and the Advantage which their Enemies have made of them, are no Objections to *Chriſtianity* itſelf. On the contrary, if *Chriſtianity*, as revealed in the *New Teſtament*, does not contradict the *Law* and the *Prophets*, in this Eſſential Doctrine; as I have ſhewn, that it does not; it may, for any thing that has yet appeared againſt it, be a continuance of the ſame Revelation, which was given to Moſes; carried-on among the *Chriſtians*, by the very ſame Perſon: to wit, by the Viſible *Jehovah*; under the Name of *Chriſt*.

They of old; ſays *Euſebius*, evidently knew, the very *Chriſt* of God. For that he appeared to *Abraham*, gave anſwers to *Iſaac*, talked with *Jacob*, converſed with *Moſes*, and afterwards with the Prophets, we have ſhewn above [ch. II.] —What then hindreth but that we may henceforth confeſs that one and the ſame way of living and the ſame kind of Religion is common to us, who have our name from *Chriſt*; with thoſe who of old ſincerely ſerved God, and were ſo dear to him(*e*).

In what light You may at preſent look-upon theſe Things, I do not pretend to divine: but,

(*e*) *Euſeb.* Eccleſ. hiſt. B. 1. ch. iv.

as

as to myſelf; the farther I have ſearched the *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian* Revelations, the more I am ſatisfied; that what I have now laid before you, is the *true* ſenſe of both: and the *only* ſenſe, in which they can be conſiſtently explained.

If I were leaving the Religion of my Anceſtors, and renouncing the Revelation which was made by *Jehovah* to our Fathers; no Man would be more obnoxious than myſelf to a Religious Dread and Horror: and even though I were ſatisfied, upon the whole, that I obeyed the voice of Reaſon; yet I ſhould not be free from Fears and Doubts. 'Tis no ſuch eaſy matter to give-up the Principles, in which we have been educated; no ſuch deſirable thing to fly-off from the Opinions of thoſe, with whom we have ſpent the flower of Life; whom we love, and by whom we hope to be beloved again. Were I in this ſituation, I ſhould almoſt become Superſtitious; and ſuſpect myſelf to be under the Influence of ſome ill-natured and turbulent Spirit, θεῖόν τι φθονερὸν καὶ ταραχῶδες (*f*), that was ſeducing me to Perdition. But when I ſee the ancient *Hebrew* Commentators, who had no Syſtematical Temptations to deſert the Truth, agreeing in the ſame Sentiments with me; when I find a Clue, that leads me through innumerable Difficulties; a Doctrine, which, inſtead of *contradicting* the

(*f*) *Herodoti Clio.*

Law and the Prophets, ſerves to *explain* and *confirm* them; perfecting the great Scheme of Providence for the eternal Happineſs of all good Men, agreeably to the ſame deſign; of which, in *Our* Scriptures, we ſometimes only ſee the *outlines*; and cannot find any poſſibility of filling up the *intermediate* Parts, which are there completed in a plain and intelligible manner: and laſtly, when I find all this grand and amazing Scheme of Wiſdom, and Goodneſs, and Power; begun, carried-on, and finiſhed, by our Own *Jehovah*; who led our Fathers out of *Egypt:* what is all this, but a continuation of the ſame *Revelation?* what is it, as *Euſebius* ſays, but the ſame *Religion?*

As to all the Miſtakes, which the modern *Chriſtians* have fallen into upon this Subject; and thereby given great occaſion to the enemies of Revelation to blaſpheme: they ſeem to be owing to one Source only; *viz.* their confining the Definition of the word God(*g*), to the *One Self-*

(*g*) *God*, when applied to the *Father*, denotes Him, who alone has all Perfections, and all Power and Dominion, abſolutely and of himſelf; original, underived, and independent of any; and who does all things according to the Counſel of his own Will: which is the *primary*, *abſolute*, and *ſupreme* ſenſe of the Word. But, when it is applied to the *Son*, it denotes One; who has NOT his Perfections, Power and Dominion, of himſelf, original and underived, and independent on any; but has them all derived

Self-exiſtent Jehovah, according to the Philoſophy and Religion of the *preſent* Times; whereas, in the *Old* and *New Teſtaments*, when Polytheiſm was the reigning Notion among Mankind, the word *God* was much more comprehenſive. The Religion of *Moſes* was a *popular* Religion, adapted to the *common Notions* of the World at that time; and delivered in the *common Language*, to Men of no Education; a parcel of ignorant Slaves, bred up to labour in the Brick Kiln. They knew nothing of the *Trinity* in *Unity*, nor the *Hypoſtatic* Union, nor any other Scholaſtic Term which Men have ſince invented. But they underſtood the word *God* in the ſame plain ſenſe, in which it was underſtood by all the neighbouring Nations; and in the ſame plain and unſcholaſtic ſenſe, in which it was underſtood by the moſt ancient Fathers; as the above Quotations ſhew: and as it is explained by Sir *Iſaac Newton*; the greateſt Man, that has ever appeared among the Moderns; whether we conſider him as a *Philoſopher* or a *Divine*.

He tells us; that "the Being, who governs all things, as *Lord* of the Univerſe; is ſtiled

rived to him from *an Other*, and always acts and wills in compliance with the will of *an Other*. In which caſe, it is manifeſtly uſed in a *ſubordinate* ſenſe. Reply to Dr. *Waterland*'s Defence, p. 171.

God is one of thoſe Words, which have been uſed in many different ſenſes. *Cudworth*, 232.

Lord God; upon account of his *Dominion*. For the Word *God* is a relative Term, and has reference to *Servants*; and *Deity* is the *Dominion* of *God:* not ſuch as a Soul has over a Body of its own, (which is the Opinion of thoſe, who make *God* the *Soul* of the World:) but ſuch as a *Governor* has over *Servants*. The Supreme *God* is an eternal infinite, abſolutely perfect Being; but a Being, how perfect ſoever, without *Dominion*, is not *Lord God*. For we ſay, My *God*, Your *God*, the *God* of *Iſrael*, the *God* of Gods and *Lord* of Lords: but we do not ſay, My *Infinite*, Your *Infinite*, the *Infinite* of *Iſrael*; we do not ſay, My *Perfect*, Your *Perfect*, the *Perfect* of *Iſrael:* for theſe have no relation to *Servants*. The term *God* very often ſignifies *Lord*; but every *Lord* is not *God*. The *Dominion* of a Spiritual Being conſtitutes him *God:* true *Dominion*, true *God*; ſupreme *Dominion*, ſupreme *God*; imaginary *Dominion*, imaginary *God*." (So alſo ſays Dr. *Whitby*, in his Laſt Thoughts; p. 21.)(*b*).

And in a Note upon this it is ſaid; "our Countryman, *Pocock*, derives the *Latin* word for *God*, *Deus*; from the *Arabic* word *Du*; [and, in the oblique Caſe, *Di:*] which ſignifies *Lord:* and in this Senſe, *Princes* are called *Gods*(*i*); and *Moſes* is called the *God* of his Bro-

(*b*) And in this ſenſe he that hath Spiritual Dominion over us is our God, whether it be ſupreme or not.

(*i*) *Pſ.* lxxxii. 6—*Jo.* x. 34.

ther

ther *Aaron*, and the *God* of King *Pharaoh*(*k*); and in the ſame ſenſe, the *Souls* of dead *Princes*, were called of old, *Gods*, by the *Gentiles*; but falſely, on Account of their want of *Dominion*(*l*)."

Agreeable to this were the Notions of the vulgar *Heathens:* for when they deïfied their great Men, they knew that they had lived in this World; where they were born and died. Such were the *Gods* of *Egypt*, before *Menes*; as *Ammon*, *Seſoſtris*, *Orus*; and the *Gods* of *Crete*, *Saturn* and *Jupiter*; and the *Gods* of *Syria*, *Hadad*, and his Wife *Arathes* and Succeſſor *Hazäel:* Such was *Thöas* or *Cinyras*, King of *Cyprus*; deïfied by the Name of *Baal-Canaan*, or *Vulcan*; and his *Wife Calycopis*, the Mother of *Æneas*; the *Venus*, the *Dea Cypria* and *Dea Syria* of the Ancients. And ſuch were the Deïfications, which were introduced from *Phœnicia* into *Greece*; and were ſo common, about the time of the *Trojan* War(*m*); and continued among the *Romans*, where thoſe Deïties were particularly diſtinguiſhed by the name *Divi*. None of theſe were ever thought to be *ſelfexiſtent*, even by the *Vulgar*; and yet were called by the name of *Gods:* becauſe they were ſuppoſed to be Spiritual Beings, who after their

(*k*) *Ex.* iv. 16. vii. 1. (*l*) Sir *Iſaac Newton*'s Scholium Generale, at the end of his *Principia*. (*m*) Sir *Iſaac Newton*'s Chronology.

Deaths,

Deaths, were advanced to a Dominion over the Affairs of this World; as *Horace* ſays of the Conquerers at the *Olympic* Games; that their Conqueſts did exalt them to the *Gods*, the *Lords* of the Earth(*n*). And this was not only the ſenſe of the *Vulgar*, as to the *Divi*; but even of the *Philoſophers* themſelves, as to thoſe Gods which never had lived in this World; *qui ſemper a Corporis compedibus & nexibus liberi*(*o*). For *Maximus Tyrius* tells us; that, "amongſt the various Opinions, all Countries agree in this; that there is One *God*, the *King* and *Father* of *all*; and Many *Gods*, the *Sons* of *God*, Partakers with him in his *Government*(*p*)." And this was the Opinion of *Plato*; with reſpect to the *inferior* Gods: that their *Subſtance* was eternal; but as to their *Formation* and perſonal *Exiſtence*, they received it from the *ſelf-exiſtent* God(*q*): and to *Them* the World was

(*n*) *Hor.* Lib. I. Ode i. Terrarum dominos evehit ad Deos. So *Pythagoras*, ἴσσιαι ἀθάνατος Θιὸς, ἄμβροτος, ἐκ ἴτι θνητός· and *Cicero* ſays; Deos eſſe Dominos et Moderatores omnium rerum. De Leg. ii. So *Ovid*; Finxit in effigiem moderantum cuncta Deorum.

(*o*) Which *Apuleius* calls *Superius aliud auguſtiuſque Dæmonum genus.*

(*p*) *Maximus Tyr.* Dial. i.

(*q*) *Plut.* de Animæ procreat. p. 1014, 1017. *Phil. Cantab.* Remarks on Dr. *Waterland*'s ſecond Defence; p. 54, &c.

Subject,

Subject, and put in order by *Them*(*r*). And this is the Reaſon which is given us by *Herodotus*, why they were called *Gods*; Θεοὶ, ὅτι κόσμῳ θέντες τὰ πάντα πρήγματα καὶ πάσας νομὰς εἶχον(*s*)· becauſe They diſpoſed the whole Univerſe, and all the Parts of it, in order; and preſerved them in it: agreeable to *Heb.* iii. 4. ὁ δὲ κατασκευάσας τὰ πάντα Θεός· But he that built all things is God. So *Moſes*, the Son of *Nachman*, ſays of the Angel in the Buſh; he is called an *Angel*, becauſe he governs the World(*t*). 'Tis true, that *Plato* in his *Cratylus*, in which he ſeems to ridicule ſeveral uncouth Etymologies; derives the word Θεὸς from θέω, *curro*; ὡς ἀεὶ τὸν δρόμον· But it is probable, *Plato* here means the heavenly Bodies, which were ſuppoſed to have an Influence and Power over Men, agreeable to *Onatus* the *Pythagorëan*; who, after declaring the belief of One *God*, the Greateſt, and Higheſt; adds, τοὶ δ' ἄλ-

(*r*) *Stobæus* ſays, The multitude of the Gods is the work of the *Demiurgus*, or *Crëator*; made by him together with the World. *Ecl. Phyſ.* c. i. *Cudworth*; p. 462.

(*s*) *Herodotus* in *Eut.* 52. ſays, " the *Pelaſgians* before this ſacrificed and prayed to the Gods in general; as I was informed at *Dodona:* attributing to none any *Name*; for they had never heard of any. But they called them Gods upon this account, becauſe κόσμῳ θέντες, &c. quod univerſum ordine diſpoſitum, omneſque ejus partes cöercerent."

(*t*) Notæ ad *Grot.* de Verit. Lib. V. And *R. Menahem* makes the ſame remark.

λοι οἱ θεοὶ εἰσι κατ' ἐμὲ· meaning the heavenly Bodies(*u*). For in his *Timæus* he ſeems to agree with *Herodotus*, and derive it from τίθημι. ἔτω δὴ πυρός τε καὶ γῆς ὕδωρ ἀέρά γε ὁ θεὸς ἐν μέσῳ βείς. And neither *Herod*, nor *Auguſtus*, nor any of the Emperors or Kings of the *Egyptians*, *Aſſyrians*, *Greeks* or *Romans*, could poſſibly underſtand the flattering appellation of *Divi*, in any other ſenſe; or conceive, that their Divinity at all related to their metaphyſical *Natures*; but merely to their *Dominion*. And accordingly the great *Selden*, ſpeaking of the Ancients' miſunderſtanding *Moſes*, ſays; "they received from their Fathers, that the Sun, Moon and Stars, were *Rulers* of the Day and Night, Light and Darkneſs; which interpreting in a wrong ſenſe, they imagined them to be *Gods*; chiefly becauſe *ſupreme Dominion* is juſtly looked-upon as the chief [Sign, Proof] Symbol of *Divinity*(*x*)."

In the Old Teſtament, the words *El*, *Elohim*, *Adonai*, are appellatives; and are all tranſlated into *Engliſh*, by the word *God:* and in

(*u*) *Cudworth*, p. 233.

(*x*) A Patribus acceperunt Solem, Lunam & Stellas, Dominos eſſe Diei & Noctis, Lucis & Tenebrarum: quod perperam interpretate etiam Deos eſſe ipſos non dubitabant; maxime cum ſupremum Dominium potiſſimum Divinitatis Symbolum merito habeatur. *Selden* de Diis *Syris* prol. ch. iii. See *Whitby*'s Laſt Thoughts; p. 21. 25.

the

the LXX, by Θεὸς. But the word *Jehovah*(*y*) is the *proper Name* of the *ſelf-exiſtent God*, and is appropriated to *Him* alone; and never uſed of any other Perſon, but His *Angel* or *Meſſenger* who ſpeaks in His *Name*; and therefore ought not to have been tranſlated into any other Language: For when we uſe the *appellative* Word *God*, [*El Elohim*, *Adonai*, &c.] inſtead of the *proper* Name *Jehovah*, it does not convey the ſame determinate ſenſe; as it does not direct us to underſtand the *ſelf-exiſtent God*, rather than an inferior Being; or the *true* God, rather than a *falſe* one: but extends to all ſpiritual Beings, who either *have* Dominion in the World, or are *ſuppoſed* to have it: and ſometimes much farther. As

I. The Appellative *Elohim* is ſometimes applied to *Jehovah* himſelf: as *Elohim* ſaid unto *Moſes*; "moreover, ſay unto the Children of *Iſrael*; *Jehovah*, the *Elohim* of your Fathers, the *Elohim* of *Abraham*, the *Elohim* of *Iſaac*,

(*y*) *Jehovah*, as explained by *Maimonides*, in *More Nevochim*, is the *eternal Being*. But Mr. *Ainſworth* interprets it more particularly; and ſays, it cometh of *havath*, *he was*; and by the firſt letter, *I*, it ſignifies, *he will be*: and by the ſecond, *HO*, it ſignifies, *he is*. And *R. Bechai* ſays; that theſe three times, paſt, preſent and to come, are comprehended in this proper name; as is known to all. *Ainſworth* on *Gen.* ii. 4. Thus it anſwers to the name of *God* in the *Apocalypſe* iv. 8. ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος.

and the *Elohim* of *Jacob*, hath ſent me unto you(*z*).

II. At other times it is uſed to ſignify the *Gods* of the *Heathens*; as, He that ſacrificeth unto any *Elohim*, ſave unto *Jehovah* only; he ſhall be utterly deſtroyed(*a*). And again, "Wilt thou not poſſeſs that, which *Chemoſh* thy *Elohim* giveth thee to poſſeſs? So whomſoever *Jehovah* our *Elohim* ſhall drive out from before us, them will we poſſeſs(*b*)." Here we ſee *Jehovah* and *Chemoſh*, the one the proper Name of the true *God* of *Iſrael*, and the other of the falſe *God* of the *Ammonites*, are both called by the ſame Word *Elohim*; being included in the general Notion of Spiritual Beings, having Dominion in the Government of the World. And in this ſenſe the Word Θεὸς is uſed by St. *Paul*; when he calls *Satan* the *God* of this World(*c*): but neither *Satan*, nor any of the Heathen *Gods*, are ever called *Jehovah*.

III. Sometimes the Word *Elohim* is farther extended; and is not confined to *ſpiritual* Dominion only: and in this ſenſe *Princes* and *Magiſtrates* are called by that Name: as "thou

(*z*) *Ex.* iii. 15. *Gen.* xiv. 18. *Deut.* vi. 4. (*a*) *Ex.* xxii. 20. of the Golden Calf, *Ex.* xxxii. 14, 23, 31, of Dagon, *Jud.* xvi, 23. of Aſhtaroth, Chemoſh, Milcom, I Kings xi. 33. (*b*) *Jud.* xi. 24. (*c*) II *Cor.* iv. 4.

ſhalt

ſhalt not revile the *Gods*, nor curſe the *Ruler* of of thy People(*d*):" "*God* ſtanding in the Congregation of the *mighty*; he judgeth among the *Gods*(*e*)." [*Elohim.*] And ſo, again(*f*); "I have ſaid, Ye are [*Elohim*] *Gods.*" And,

IV. The Word is ſometimes uſed, when it neither ſignifies Dominion nor Spirituality; as when *They* are called *Elohim*, [*Gods*] to whom the Word of *God* came; and they ſpake in his Name, and by his Authority(*g*): as when *Jehovah* ſays to *Moſes*, See I have made thee [*Elohim*] a *God* to *Pharaoh*(*h*).

It appears therefore from the Scriptures; that the word *Elohim*, [*God*] does not include in it *always* the Idea of *ſupremacy* and *ſelf-exiſtence*; as the word *Jehovah* does: and may therefore be applied to other Beings, who are not *ſupreme*, nor *ſelf-exiſtent*. And therefore, when *Chriſt* tells us; the Scripture calls them *Gods* to whom the *Word* of *God* came; and St. *Paul* ſays, there are *Gods* many, and *Lords* many: it is certain, they did not mean to uſe the word *Gods* in the ſenſe of the word *Jehovah*; and to ſay, there are many *Jehovahs* or ſelf-exiſtent *Gods*; [for in that ſenſe they would have contradicted the Scripture; which declares, *Jehovah* our *Elohim*, *Jehovah* is *One*:] but they uſed the word *Gods*,

(*d*) *Ex.* xxii. 28. (*e*) *Pſ.* lxxxii. 1. (*f*) ver. 6.
(*g*) *John* x. 34. 35. (*h*) *Ex.* vii 1.

in the true meaning of the Appellative *Elohim*; whoſe ſignification is not ſo confined.

On the contrary, if the word *God* in Scripture did always ſignify the ſelf-exiſtent *Being*, or ſupreme *God*; it would be impoſſible to make ſenſe of it. I ſhall only inſtance in that grand Title, which is given to *Jehovah*, in many parts of the Old Teſtament; that he is *God* of *Gods*, and *Lord* of *Lords*: Can we poſſibly underſtand the word *Gods*, in this place, to ſignify *ſelf-exiſtent* Beings, and *ſupreme* Lords of the Univerſe; [as the Moderns generally confine the uſe of the word *God*, in their philoſophical Diſquiſitions:] and that *Jehovah* is a *ſelf-exiſtent* Being over other *ſelf-exiſtent* Beings? This is impoſſible to be the meaning; becauſe there can be but One *ſelf-exiſtent* Being. And conſequently, the words, *God* of *Gods*, and *Lord* of *Lords*, are relative to *Dominion* only; and have no relation to *Selfexiſtence* at all. They are expreſſive of the word *Elohim*; and not of the word *Jehovah*.

But to finiſh this Inquiry: when *Jacob* vowed a Vow, ſaying; if *Jehovah* will be with me, and keep me in the way that I go; and will give me Bread to eat, and Garments to put-on; ſo that I come again unto my Father's houſe in Peace; then ſhall *Jehovah* [or, as the *Chaldee* has it, the *Word* of *Jehovah*] be my [*Elohim* or] *God*: the plain meaning of this is; He ſhall be my *Lord* and Governor, and I will put myſelf under His *Dominion*.

Dominion. And as the Dominion of the viſible *Jehovah* is believed by the *Chriſtians* to be now extended over the whole World, *Gentiles* as well as *Jews*; as was foretold by *Iſaiah*, xlix. God having made him both *Lord* and *Chriſt*; He is their *God*, or *Elohim*, as he is Ours; our peculiarity being now ended: And accordingly, when *Thomas* the Apoſtle believed him to be the *Chriſt*, he acknowledges him as ſuch, by an Expreſſion of the utmoſt Force and Propriety; my *Lord* and my *God*; that is, my *Adonai* and my *Elohim*.

Thus we ſee, the Charge of Polytheïſm againſt the *Chriſtians*, ariſes from not diſtinguiſhing the different ſenſes of the Word [Θεὸς, *Deus*,] *God*, as uſed in the Scriptures; ſometimes in the ſenſe of the word *Elohim*, in which ſenſe there are *many* Gods; and ſometimes in the ſenſe of *Jehovah*, in which there is but *One*. But as long as the *Chriſtians* obſerve this Diſtinction, and allow of but One *ſupreme God*, but One *ſelf-exiſtent Jehovah*; there is not the leaſt ground for any ſuch charge. And all thoſe who argue, from confounding thoſe two ſenſes of the word *God*; that there is but one *Elohim*, becauſe there is but one *Jehovah*: and that *Chriſt* cannot be *God*, [*Elohim*] except he be [*Jehovah*] the *ſupreme ſelf-exiſtent God* (arbitrarily confining the word *God* to mean *Jehovah*, as if there were no other meaning in it;) differ

in

in their Language from the Writers of all Antiquity; whether Sacred or Profane: and directly contradict the Aſſertions of *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles. And if they worſhip two different Perſons, each of them as *Jehovah* the *ſupreme God*; they are Polytheiſts: and this would be the Caſe of all the *Pſeudo-Athanaſians*; if they ſaw and allowed thoſe Conſequences, which follow unavoidably from their Principles.

But thoſe, who carefully diſtinguiſh the two ſenſes of the word *God*, as they are uſed in the Scriptures; and believe that *Chriſt* was inveſted with the Name of *God*; "becauſe he was ſo faithful, becauſe he aſſumed nothing to Himſelf, that he might fulfil the Commands of Him that ſent him (*i*); that he has all his Titles, viz. *Son* of *God*, *Lord*, *Word*, &c. from his being begotten of the *Father* by his *Will* (*k*);" and that he is *Lord* of *Hoſts*, [Κύριος δυναμέων] by the will of the *Father* that giveth him power (*l*); and that he is conſtituted *Almighty* by the Father (*m*) and *Lord* of the whole Creation (*n*); cannot attribute the ſame honour to all Beings, who have the Name of *God*: but believe in one *Jehovah*, who is Selfexiſtent and Supreme over all; to

(*i*) *Lactan* lib. IV. c. xiv.

(*k*) *Juſt. Mart. Tryph.* p. 74. Edit. *Paris.*

(*l*) Ibid. p. 91.

(*m*) *Hip.* con. *Noet.* p. 50.

(*n*) *Novat.* de Trin. c. xv. Παντοκράτωρ παρὰ παντὸς καθηγάθη Χριστός.

whom

whom all other Beings in the Univerſe, though called by the Name of *God*, [*Elohim*] even *Chriſt* himſelf, are ſubject; as he hath ſo often and ſo plainly declared. And therefore *Euſebius* ſays; "it is not neceſſary, by ſuppoſing the *Father* and *Son* diſtinct *Subſtances*, to ſuppoſe them two *Gods*; for we do not attribute equal honour unto them." So then the *Chriſtians* ſuppoſe the Government of the World to be a Monarchy, under one *Elohim*; whom we diſtinguiſh from all others by his proper Name, *Jehovah*; and there is no Supreme, Self-exiſtent *Elohim*, [*God*] but only that One *Jehovah*(*o*).

Biſhop *Pearſon* hath expreſſed this Opinion of the *Chriſtians*, with great ſtrength and judgement. "We muſt not therefore, ſays he, ſo far endeavour to involve ourſelves in the darkneſs of this Myſtery; as to deny that Glory, which is clearly due unto the *Father*; whoſe Prëeminence undeniably conſiſteth in this, that he is *God*, not of any Other, but of Himſelf; and there is no other Perſon that is *God*, but is *God* of him. It is no diminution to the *Son*, to ſay He is from another; for his very Name imports as much: but it were a diminution to the *Father*, to ſpeak ſo of him; and there muſt be ſome prëeminence, where there is room for derogation. What the *Father* is, he is from *None*; what the *Son* is, he is from Him: what

(*o*) *Euſebius.*

the

the *First* is, he giveth; what the *Second* is, he *receiveth*. The First is a *Father* indeed, by reaſon of his *Son*; but he is not a *God*, by reaſon of *Him*: whereas the *Son* is not only ſo, in regard to the *Father*; but alſo *God*, by reaſon of the ſame(*p*).

If it be ſtill objected, both to the *Jews* and *Chriſtians*; that the worſhip of more than one *Perſon* is Idolatry; notwithſtanding we do not worſhip more than one *ſupreme God*: I am afraid, we ſhall only diſpute about Words: and, to avoid ſuch trifling, it will be neceſſary to conſider,

I. What we mean by *Worſhip*; and

II. What we mean by *Idolatry*.

Certain it is, that every intelligent Being in the Univerſe hath a Reſpect and Honour due to him, in proportion to his real worth and Character; from every intelligent Being, who is acquainted with Him: and no One, who is not very weak and ſuperſtitious, would think of omitting that proper Honour and Reſpect, which is another's due, merely for fear of Idolatry; which he *could not* be guilty-of, except by paying him *ſuch* Worſhip and Reſpect, as belong to *God* only. For no Being can be guilty of Idolatry; by aſking favours of any Perſon, either human or divine, who has a power and right to diſpenſe them as he pleaſes; be-

(*p*) *Pearſon* on the Creed, p. 35.

cauſe

cauſe, wherever there is a right to *benefit* and *aſſiſt*, and *reward*, thither common ſenſe and reaſon teach us to direct our *Addreſſes*; and whoſe-ſoever Servants we are, to him we are to aſcribe *Dominion* over us. Nor can there be any Idolatry in returning Thanks to that Being, whether human or divine; from whom we have received a Benefit: for this is no more than an Act of Gratitude. And therefore, when we talk-of the Idolatry of worſhipping more than One Perſon, we muſt conſider what *kind* of Reſpect and Deference we mean to include in that Word: for all that Regard, and Reverence, and Reſpect, and Supplication, and Prayer, and Thankſgiving, which is due to any one, who is able and willing, and has a right to aſſiſt us; cannot be wrong; but perfectly right and fit: call it by what Name you pleaſe.

Now the *Greek* word προσκύνησις, or *Worſhip*, is capable of ſeveral ſenſes; as it implies different degrees of Honour and Reſpect.

1. It means the Worſhip due to the Supreme *God*; as in *Matt.* iv. 10. Thou ſhalt *worſhip* the *Lord* thy *God*: and the ſame Word is commonly uſed in the LXX, for the *Worſhip* of falſe *Gods* alſo.

2. It is uſed to ſignify the Reſpect and Reverence, which was offered or tendered to an *Angel*; and refuſed. *Rev.* xxii. 8, 9.

3. It is uſed to ſignify the Honours paid to the *Kings*, among the *Jews:* and all the congregation bleſſed the Lord God of their Fathers, and bowed down their heads and worſhipped [προσκυνησαν] the *Lord* and the *King* (q): and this worſhip was ſometimes paid by Proſtration, as it was uſed to the *King* of *Perſia* (r).

4. It is uſed for the Honour and Reſpect paid in Supplication, from a Servant to his Maſter. *Matt.* xviii. 26.

5. It is uſed for the Reſpect which was offered to *Peter*, by *Cornelius*; and was rejected. *Acts* x. 25.

That a *Worſhip* therefore ſhould be paid to the Viſible *Jehovah*, of ſome kind or other; cannot be reaſonably objected-to by any one, who conſiders; that it was paid not only to the true God, but alſo to Kings, Maſters, and Equals: and the Queſtion will be reduced to this one point, what *kind* of Worſhip is due to him, whom God hath made a *Prince*, and a *Saviour*, and put all things under his Feet; and given him power to raiſe the Dead, and exalted him above all Principality and Power: and, on the other hand, what Worſhip paid to him is Idolatrous; when even the worſhip of the *Jewiſh* and *Perſian* Kings, by Proſtration, does not appear

(q) I *Chron.* xxix. 20. II *Sam.* ix. 6.

(r) *Polyhym.* ἀνάγκη σφι προσφέρειν προσκυνεῖν Βασιλέα προσπίπτοντας. II *Sam.* ix. 6—xix. 18.

to

to have had any more Idolatry in it; than bowing the Head, or bending the Knee; Cuſtoms now uſed in *Europe*.

The next Inquiry therefore will be; what it is, that diſtinguiſhes an *Idolatrous* Worſhip from one that is not ſo. And to find this, we muſt conſider; what there was in the Idolatrous Practiſes condemned by *God* in the *Old Teſtament*, different from the Worſhip we have hitherto conſidered; or what it was, that made *Their* worſhip ſinful and *Ours* not ſo.

And here we ſhall find a difference in two very material Circumſtances; as firſt, the Idolatrous Worſhip of former Ages was a Worſhip of *God*, by *Similitude* or *Symbol:* or, 2. An Addreſs to imperfect and impotent Beings; together with a tranſlation of that Honour to *another* Perſon, which is only due to *God:* both which are prejudicial to the Worſhip of *God*, and the well-being of Mankind; and therefore condemned by *God*.

1. We find; that God reſents, as Idolatrous, the Worſhip of himſelf by any *Symbol*, or *Similitude*; by which we mean to repreſent his Perſon: as Images, Paintings, and ſuch like. This kind of Worſhip introduces low and unworthy Notions of *God*; and repreſents him as material, finite, and ſubject to abuſe and decay; impotent, and many ways imperfect. But this is not the Caſe, in the Worſhip of the Viſible *Je-*

Jovah; becauſe we never ſuppoſe him to be the Symbol or corporeal Repreſentation of the Supreme God; but a different Being, the *Angel*, or *Meſſenger* of the Supreme God; whoſe Similitude conſiſts in his *natural* and *moral* Perfections, and is only viſible to the *Underſtanding*.

But 2dly, we find alſo; that *God* reſents, as Idolatrous, the giving His Honour to another. When we ſpeak of the Honour which is given to *God*, we mean nothing elſe but the unavoidable Approbation of the Underſtanding, upon knowing the Perfections of God, and in what manner He has acted; and declaring theſe things to others. For the higheſt Honour and Praiſe that can be given to *God*, is to ſpeak the plain Truth of him; and repreſent him as he is: and the giving God's Honour to *Another*, conſiſts in giving that Praiſe and Thanks to *another* Being, which we owe to *God*: and acknowledging *another* to be the Author of thoſe good, wiſe, and powerful Actions, which proceed from *God*. And conſequently, the prejudice we receive, by attributing to any *other* Being what *God* has done for us, or what He alone *is* in his own Nature; is this; that it prevents us from knowing Him, and loving Him, and ſetting our dependence upon Him; and becoming ſenſible of what is juſt, and good and true, by contemplating His Nature and Actions. For as our Notions of *God* are depraved, and we loſe ſight of the *all-perfect* Cha-

Character; which we muſt naturally and neceſſarily do, by attributing to *Another* the Honour that is due to *Him alone*; ſo will our Notions of every moral Perfection be depraved in proportion. And as our Notions of moral Perfection become depraved, by giving to *Another* the Honour due to *God*; ſo likewiſe will the obligation to the practice of thoſe Virtues we admire, be rendered weak and precarious by it. For no Being can think it abſolutely neceſſary to be perfect; if he believes the *God*, who is his *Judge*, is not ſo Himſelf: and therefore, if we conſider ourſelves as dependent on any other Beings for Happineſs of any kind, as upon *Saints*, or *Angels*, &c. who are *impotent* and *imperfect*, whoſe Worſhip can neither make us better nor wiſer, [for we know nothing of their moral Character, but their Imperfection] and whoſe Favours cannot be directed by *ſupreme* Wiſdom, Juſtice and Goodneſs; we ſhall be encouraged to expect the Enjoyment of Happineſs and Reward, without the practiſe of Virtue; and make court to ſuch Beings by *Flattery*, and not by *moral Improvement*. But this is not the Caſe, in the Worſhip of *Chriſt*: He is in no reſpect either impotent or imperfect; but appeared to our Fathers, arrayed in all the Power and Majeſty, and moral Attributes of *God*; Grace, Mercy, Goodneſs, and Truth (*s*): being a moſt perfect Pattern for

(*s*) *Ex.* xxxiv. 6, 7.

our

our Imitation; ſo that no favour can be expected from Him, but by endeavouring to deſerve it: He will accept no Prayers, but what the inviſible *Jehovah* accepts through Him; and confers no Favours, but what the inviſible *Jehovah* confers by Him; for what we receive by *Him*, we receive by order and command of the *ſupreme* God; and in this ſenſe it is, that the *Father* and *Son* are *One*: or, to ſpeak in the words of *Juſtin Martyr*; "I affirm, that the *Son* never *did* or *ſaid* any thing; but what it was the Will of the Maker of the Univerſe, above whom there is no *God*, that He ſhould both *do* and *ſay*(*t*)." And as it is through Him, that we receive Bleſſings from the ſupreme *God*; ſo, in return for what we receive, the Worſhip which we pay *Him* is directed *ultimately* to the ſupreme *God*(*u*). And there can be no more wonder, that St. *Paul* ſhould pray to him, under Difficulties; as he did three times, upon the ſame Occaſion (*x*); or that *Stephen* ſhould recommend his Spirit to him, when he was dying(*y*), or that *John* ſhould repreſent in Viſion the twenty-four Elders falling down before him; and offering-up to him, as Incenſe, the Prayers of the Saints(*z*), or that

(*t*) *Juſt. Mart.* Dial. p. 69. *Jackſon*, p. 130.

(*u*) The Father, ſays *Euſebius*, is the Lord and God of the Son; and therefore all Religious Knowledge centers in *One* Original and in *One* God. *Demonſt. Evang.* lib. III. c. viii. (*x*) II *Cor.* xii. 8, 9. (*y*) *Acts* vii. 59. (*z*) *Rev.* v. 8.

the

the whole Company of *Chriſtians* ſhould worſhip him at his Aſcenſion; [προσκυνήσαιλις αὐτόν] than that *Jacob* ſhould bleſs *Joſeph*, and ſay; "*God*, [*Elohim*] before whom my Fathers *Abraham* and *Iſaac* did walk; the *God*, which fed me all my Life long, unto this Day: the *Angel*, which redeemed me from all Evil; bleſs the Lads:" &c(*a*). And beſides theſe Reaſons, which are common to the *Jews* and *Chriſtians*; the latter have alſo this additional one, why they pray immediately to *Chriſt* himſelf: *viz.* becauſe he is *not now* in the Character of God's *Angel* or *Meſſenger*; but has actually received the *Kingdom*, which was prophecied-of by *Daniel* to be given to the *Son of Man*; and now acts as *King* in his *own Kingdom*; and can give eternal Life to as many as he will. *John* xvii. 2. In a word; the *Meſſiahſhip* of *Jeſus* denotes his Royal Commiſſion and Power; or his Right, by Divine Deſignation, to Dominion and Judicature over Mankind(*b*). So that the Worſhip they pay him, is only that of *Subjects* to their *King*. The Worſhip of *Chriſt* therefore is free from all thoſe offenſive Circumſtances, which render Idolatry diſpleaſing to *God*; and therefore ought not to be called by that Name(*c*).

(*a*) *Gen.* xlviii. 15, 16. (*b*) *Farmer*, on Miracles, p. 370. (*c*) *Whitby*'s Laſt Thoughts, p. 24.

But

But however theſe Arguments may appear concluſive to *Me*; they may not, perhaps, do ſo to *You*: and therefore, in the laſt place, it is but fair and juſt to obſerve; that, whether the Fathers of the *Chriſtian* Church have judged rightly or not of theſe Texts, on which they have founded the Worſhip of *Chriſt* upon the expreſs Command of *God*; and whether I have reaſoned properly or not in deducing the Rectitude of it from his high Station, Character and *Spiritual* Dominion, as being conſtituted King and Heir of all things; yet it is certain that *Chriſt* is no-where *directly* commanded to be prayed-to, through the whole *New Teſtament*(*d*): and I am credibly informed; that many of thoſe, who allow it to be defenſible, yet do not conſider it as a Duty; and very ſeldom, if ever, practiſe it; Conſidering, that *God* and *Chriſt* are in this reſpect *One* and the ſame; and that the Kingdom of *Chriſt* is ſtill the Kingdom of *God*, though he has conſtituted *Chriſt* to be King of it. For the Heavenly Kingdom can no more be given out of his power, by conferring it on *Chriſt*; than an Earthly Kingdom can be made

(*d*) I obſerve, ſays Mr. *Emlyn*, no one inſtance of Prayer to *Jeſus Chriſt*, when abſent, either required in the Precept, or reported in the Example, through the whole *New Teſtament*; only what is ſuppoſed under the general Phraſe of calling on his Name. *Emlyn*'s Tracts: Vol. I P. 55.

inde-

independent of *Him*, by beſtowing it on *Nebuchadnezzar*, *Cyrus*, or *Alexander*; and therefore our Prayers may ſtill be directed to the *ſupreme* God, without any derogation from the Honour due to *Chriſt*: nay, they muſt be ſo; if they regard our future State, beyond the duration of the αἰὼν, or *Age* of the *Meſſiah*: for then ſhall *Chriſt* deliver-up to the *Father* that Kingdom, which he received from him; that *God* may be all in all(*e*). In the mean time, they think it moſt proper to direct their Prayers to the *ſupreme* God himſelf, through *Jeſus Chriſt*; as the Mediator between *God* and Man: this being the way, in which *Chriſt* directed them to pray.

The Opinion of *Origen* upon this Subject, is as follows. We ought to pray to *God* only, but not *without* our High-prieſt; we ought not to pray [that is, *ultimately*] to him, who is appointed by the *Father* to be our High-prieſt and

(*e*) I *Cor.* xv. 28. *Chriſt* himſelf REIGNS; [Βασιλεύει] or has a Kingdom properly his own, till that time; [*viz.* the General Reſurrection] but after that cometh the End: when, having made a ſolemn diſtribution of Rewards and Puniſhments to his Subjects, he ſhall deliver up his Kingdom to the *Father*.—When he delivers up his *Kingdom*, he does in effect really deliver up to his *Father* all things implied in it; his Royal Dignity and Rule, as ſuch; and the Body of his Subjects alſo; as now no longer His Kingdom, in the peculiar ſenſe in which they were ſo before. Biſhop *Hoadly's* Anſwer to the Dean of *Worceſter's* Sermon; p. 108, 106.

whom the *Father* hath made our Advocate; but to the *Father*, *through* our High-prieſt and Advocate, [or Comforter(*f*).] And again; we ought to ſend-up Supplication, and Prayers, and Interceſſion, and Thankſgiving to the *Supreme* God over all; *through* our High-prieſt, the Living Word and *God*; who is above all *Angels*: yet we may alſo offer Supplications, and Interceſſions, and Thankſgivings, and Prayers, to the *Word himſelf*; *if we can diſtinguiſh* between Prayer in a *proper*, and Prayer in a *figurative* ſenſe(*g*). And what he means by this diſtinction, he clearly explains in another place; *viz.* "We Worſhip the One *God*, and his *Son*, and *Word*, and *Image*, with Supplication and Prayers, to the utmoſt of our Power: putting-up our Prayers to the *God* of the Univerſe, *through* his only-begotten *Son*; to whom we offer them firſt: deſiring him, as being the Propitiation of our Sins, to preſent to our High-prieſt our Prayers and Sacrifices, (Thankſgivings,) and Interceſſions to the *ſupreme* God(*h*)."

The Obſervation of the learned Biſhop *Bull*, upon theſe two Paſſages of *Origen*, is as follows. "I wonder, that theſe places of *Origen* ſhould offend the learned *Huetius*; in which Places (to confeſs the Truth) I always thought, for my own part; that the *Catholic* Doctrine, concerning the Perſon and Office of Our *Saviour*,

(*f*) *De Orat.* p. 50, 51, &c. (*g*) Lib. V. p. 233.
(*h*) Adv. *Celſ.* Lib. VIII. p. 386.

was

was well explained(*i*)." It appears from theſe Comments; that the Worſhip paid to *Chriſt*, and to *God* through him, as through the *alone* Mediator, is not a ſeparate and independent Worſhip of the Perſon of *Chriſt*; but a Part of the Worſhip of the *Father*, by His Command, and to His Glory(*k*).

I have now proved; in my ſecond Letter, from the Scripture, (which in many Texts is unintelligible, upon any other principle:) that the *Jehovah*, who appeared to our Fathers, and carried-on the Government of the World, during all the former Diſpenſations; was the *Angel* of the *Covenant*:

And I have ſhewn, in this Letter; that the many Texts which I referred-to in proof of it, were ſo underſtood by the moſt ancient as well as the modern Interpreters of the Old Teſtament; both *Jews* and *Chriſtians*.

And though it may be imagined, and perhaps true; that ſome of the Texts, which I have interpreted of the Angel *Jehovah*, ought to be explained of *God* the *Father*: yet this Objection can be of no weight, as to the general Argument; becauſe, as I have obſerved, (and I lay the greateſt ſtreſs upon it;) if it appear manifeſtly in any *one* Text, that the *Jehovah* men-

(*i*) *Defen.* Sect. ii. Cap. ix. § 15. (*k*) Obſervations on Dr. *Waterland's* ſecond Defence; p. 79. *Whitby's* Laſt Thoughts; p. 73.

tioned in the Old Teſtament was the *Angel* of the *Covenant*; and not the *Jehovah*, who *ſent* that *Angel*; that ſame *Jehovah-Angel* muſt always be underſtood, wherever he is ſpoken-of, to be the ſame *identical* Perſon, the ſame *metaphyſical*, *conſcious* Subſtance, through the *whole* Revelation: And what farther confirms this, is; that the Name of *Jehovah* ſeems to have been never put upon any more than One *Angel:* and no other will appear to be called by that Name, through the whole Scripture(*l*).

So that we may ſafely conclude, from the whole; that all the affairs of Mankind, relative to the Government of the *Jews* and *Chriſtians*, have been carried-on by the ſame *Being*; either in *Perſon*, or by His *Angels*; who appeared to our Forefathers, and converſed with them: to wit; the *Logos*, or *Word* of *God*.

It remains to be proved; that the very *ſame* Perſon was born of the Virgin *Mary*, and appeared in the Character of *Meſſiah:* or, in other Words, that *Jeſus* of *Nazareth* is the *Chriſt:* that to him the Prophecies of the *Meſſiah*, and the return of the *Jehovah* Angel to bring-in a new Covenant, do properly belong; and are incapable of a Completion in any other *Perſon*—Or, in the Words of *Clemens Alexand.* part of which I have already quoted;

(*l*) *Euſeb.* Eccl. Hiſt. B. I. ch. ii. quoted.

and

and the other Part ſhall be reſerved to the next Letter: that, " the *Word* is the *Face* of *God*; by whom he manifeſts himſelf, and makes himſelf known. The Ancients had the Old Teſtament, and the Law inſtructed them by Fear; and the *Word* was an *Angel:* Λόγος Ἄγγελος ἦν. But the New People have received the New Teſtament; καὶ Λόγος γεγένηται· and the *Word* is made or begotten; and the *Fear* is turned into *Love*; καὶ ὁ μυστικὸς ἐκεῖνος Ἄγγελος τέτέλται· and that myſtical *Angel* is born." *Pædag.* Lib. I. Cap. vii. Page 110, 111.

POST,

POSTSCRIPT

TO

THE THIRD LETTER.

TO confirm what I have advanced above, in the ſecond and third Letters, it may be proper to take notice; how thoſe Writers, who aſſert that *Chriſt* is the *ſupreme* God, or a *mere* Man, are forced to defend their Opinions, by denying the moſt eſſential Articles of *Chriſtianity*; and, after all their Evaſions, are not able to explain themſelves upon any other Principles, than thoſe which I have maintained.

1ſt. We are told, by *Chriſt* himſelf; that he *came down* from Heaven, from the *Father*; but by the Philoſophical *Chriſtians*, who ſuppoſe him to be the *ſupreme* God, we are informed; that this was impoſſible: becauſe, being of the ſame Subſtance with the *Father*, he is *omni-preſent*; and incapable of *local* Tranſition. This was the Anſwer, which was given by the

Fathers

Fathers to *Apollinaris*(a); as I obſerved in my firſt Letter; and the modern Divines ſpeak in the ſame manner.

Dr. *South* ſays, it is impoſſible for his *divine* Nature to *come* [down from Heaven]; becauſe, "*coming* is a Motion from the place where one *is*, to the place in which he *was not before*; whereas *Infinity*, the property of the divine *Nature*, implies a preſence *to all places*." To which it was replied; one would think then, if *Chriſt came down at all*, it muſt have been in his *human* Nature. No, ſays Dr. *South*; that which did not exiſt, before it was in the World, cannot properly be ſaid to *come* into the World; any more than the Fruit that grows upon a Tree(b).

Dr. *Sherlock* owns, that it is a Myſtery to him; how an *infinite* Being, that fills *all* Places, can be ſaid really to *deſcend* and *aſcend*: and that properly it cannot be(c). And Biſhop *Fowler*, in his Book of the Deſcent of the Man *Jeſus*, ſays; How could He properly be ſaid to *come down* from Heaven, who could not for a Moment be *out* of Heaven; any more than *God* the *Father*, from whom he is *inſeparable*(d)? And the Reaſon he gives, is; that the whole Univerſe is filled with his Preſence(e). It fol-

(a) *King*, on the Creed; p. 245. (b) *Emlyn*'s Tracts; Vol. II. p. 179. (c) Ibid. 187. (d) Deſcent, &c. p. 102. and Part 2d. page 28. (e) Ibid. 23, 24, 28.

lows

lows from hence; either that the Son of Man *did not*, becauſe he *could not*, deſcend from Heaven; or elſe, that theſe *Chriſtians* argue from a falſe Philoſophy. But to go-on:

2d. We find, in the New Teſtament; that *Chriſt* being in the Form of *God*, emptied himſelf [of that Form] ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν, and took upon him the Form of a *Servant*; and being found in faſhion as a *Man*, *humbled* himſelf(*f*). And agreeably to this Doctrine, we are told by the ſame Apoſtle—"You know the Grace of our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt*; that though he was Rich, yet for your ſakes he became Poor, that ye, through his Poverty, might be Rich(*g*)." This plain Doctrine is either denied, or made an inexplicable Myſtery. Biſhop *Bull*, ſpeaking of the συγκαλάβασις of *Chriſt* to create, of which the Fathers ſpeak, ſays; Explain to me the κένωσις and συγκαλάβασις of the *Word*, or *Son* of *God*; by which he *came-out* from the *Father*, and *deſcended* from Heaven, and was incarnate; and I will explain to you the other συγκαλάβασις: to wit, that we may both expoſe ourſelves [*inſaniamus*] by prying into the Myſteries of *God*(*h*).

Dr. *More* ſays; "it has racked many Men's Minds, to conceive; how an *exinanition*, or *emptying* Himſelf, can belong to the *eternal* and

(*f*) *Phil.* ii. (*g*) II *Cor.* viii. 9. (*h*) *Bulli* Op. p. 232.

immutable

immutable God, by becoming Man; which the Text ſeems to point-at(*i*)." And Biſhop *Fowler* ſays; "How can He, who is *abſolutely unchangeable*, be ſaid to have *emptied himſelf?* This was *abſolutely impoſſible*(*k*)." And again; "With what propriety of Speech can it be ſaid of *God*, that he was *rich*; as if he could ever be otherwiſe: or that he became *poor?*" On the other hand; "in what ſenſe can it be ſaid of *Man*, [or *Chriſt* in his humane Nature] that he was *rich*; if he never was in a richer ſtate than when on Earth, which was always extremely *poor*(*l*)?"

And again; upon *Chriſt*'s Prayer to *God*(*m*), "Glorify me with thine ownſelf; with the Glory which I had with Thee, before the World was;" he ſays; "Chriſt, *as God*, could never be without that Glory in Heaven, the Reſtoration of which is here prayed for; and Chriſt, *as Man*, could not pray to be *reſtored* to it, on ſuppoſition he *never had* it(*n*). And how, ſays his Lordſhip, can that be ſaid of *both* the Natures of *Chriſt*; which belongs to *neither?* To apply the Commutation of [Properties or] Idioms to this and ſuch like Texts, looks like doing any thing to help at a dead lift. Since we have ſeen theſe Words, "He

(*i*) Deſcent of the Man *Jeſus*; p. 120. (*k*) Ibid. 52. (*l*) Ibid. 98. (*m*) *John* xvii. 5. (*n*) Deſcent, &c. p. 40.

was rich," cannot be meaned of *Chriſt*, as *God*; ſo neither can they be ſaid of Him, as *Man*; if He never was, before he came into this poor State(*o*)."

This being the Caſe; his Lordſhip ſaw, the Doctrine contained in theſe Texts could not be explained agreeably to the common Notions of the Orthodox; upon which he ſays very honeſtly, that, rather than believe this of *Jehovah*, [*viz.* that he put-off his Glory] he ſhould be tempted to be an *Arian*; which he hopes he never ſhall be(*p*). On the other hand, he could not explain them according to the *Socinian* Doctrine; becauſe it allows of no Glory *before the World was*, which *Chriſt* had to quit: and his Lordſhip, was not ſatisfied with the *Apollinarian* Scheme, [the only one that can explain the Difficulty;] becauſe he thought it did not allow, that *Chriſt* was ever a *Man*. Surrounded thus with Difficulties on all ſides, he found it neceſſary to adopt a new Hypotheſis, unknown to the Scriptures; and founded upon mere Fancy and Invention: *viz.* "That the Soul of the *Meſſias elect* was happily united, before the generation of Men, with the *Logos*; and reſplendent with cœleſtial Glory and Beauty, among the *Angels* in Heaven." This Hypotheſis, ſays He from Dr. *More*, will give a very eaſy and natural ſenſe to

(*o*) Deſcent, &c. p. 99. (*p*) Ibid. 40, 41.

ſundry

ſundry places in the New Teſtament; that otherwiſe ſeem very obſcure: as that of *Phil.* ii. 6, 7, 8. for it hath racked many Men's Minds, to conceive; how an *exinanition*, or *emptying Himſelf*, can belong to the *eternal immutable* God, by becoming Man; which the Text points-at: But may very well belong to the Soul of the *Meſſias*; who was truely *God*, by a Phyſical Unity with the *Godhead*(*q*)."

This Hypotheſis conſiſts of two Parts: firſt, that the Soul of the *Meſſias*, that is, (as it is commonly called) the *human* Soul, had Glory in Heaven before the World began; which Glory it left: upon which I ſhall make the following Obſervations.

1. It cannot be proved from the New Teſtament; that *Chriſt* had any *other* Soul or Spirit, beſides the *Logos* or *Word* of *God*, which animated the human Body: and it appears from Reaſon; that one Spirit is ſufficient for one Body, in order to form that Being which is called a Man.

2. We read nothing in the New Teſtament, of the Præexiſtence of any Soul of *Chriſt*, different from the *Logos*; either before or after the generation of Man. Conſequently,

3. We read nothing of its happy State or reſplendence with celeſtial Glory and Beauty with the Angels: Nor of its *leaving* that Glory.

(*q*) Deſcent, &c. p. 120.

All this, from the beginning to the end, is mere Invention.

The ſecond Part of Dr. *More*'s Hypotheſis, neceſſary to be ſuppoſed, in order to complete it, and explain theſe Texts, is this; that "the *præ-exiſtent Soul* of *Chriſt* was by a Phyſical Union *united* to the *Godhead*." This was neceſſary to be ſuppoſed, in order to prove, by a *Commutation* of Idioms; that, becauſe the *Soul* of *Chriſt* was *rich* in its præ-exiſtent State, it might be ſaid of *Chriſt*, who was united to it, that *he* was rich; and, becauſe the *Soul* emptied itſelf of its Glory, it might be ſaid of *Chriſt*, that *he* emptied himſelf of his Glory.

But here the Hypotheſis meets another Check; for it has never yet been proved, nor can it be proved, that there ever was ſuch a *Phyſical Union* between the *Logos* and the *human Soul:* the plain Scripture Doctrine, that the *Word was made Fleſh*; or took a human Body, which *God* had prepared for him; being ſufficient to anſwer all the Texts upon that Subject in the New Teſtament: And his Lordſhip having "undertaken to give a clear Demonſtration, that *Jeſus* is united to the Divinity;" has abundantly failed in it.

But let us conſider his Lordſhip's Reaſoning upon the Subject: and Firſt, he ſays; "How could *He*, the *Logos*, be born in the human Fleſh; otherwiſe than as he united the Soul of *Jeſus*,

Jeſus, which informed this Fleſh, unto Himſelf; unleſs we can imagine with *Apollinaris*, that *Himſelf was the Soul of this Body?*"—Very true: and what Objection can be made to this?

"Why, his Lordſhip ſays; the Conſequence of this Doctrine, [*viz.* that the *Word* of *God* is the *Soul* of the *Meſſias*] is this; that *Jeſus* never was a *Man*." P. 50.

But his Concluſion here is too haſty; It hath been proved already, in my firſt Letter; that in the Scripture ſenſe of the Word *Man*, it means in general no more than a *ſpiritual Being in a human Body*; according to which Definition, the *Logos* or *Word* of *God* incarnate, was a *real Man*; as much as any other Perſon ever was. And indeed he became a Man more properly by taking on him the Body which *God* had prepared for him; and conſiſting only of *one* Body, and *one* Spirit, as other Men do; than if he had joined himſelf to a Soul and Body together: which would not have made him a *Man*, in any ſenſe of the Word; but a compound Being of a different Nature, to which there is no Name.

The ſecond Argument, to prove the *Union* of the *Divinity* with the *human Soul*, is taken from *Phil.* ii. where it is ſaid of *Chriſt*, that he emptied himſelf of his Glory; which, his Lordſhip ſays, cannot be ſaid of the *ſurpeme God*

God, nor of the *human Soul*, except he was in a præ-exiſtent State; and conſequently proves the præexiſtence of *Chriſt*, as a Man to whom the *Logos* was united. But this it does not prove; for the *Logos* might as well empty himſelf of his Glory, which we know he had with *God*; as the imaginary præexiſtent Soul, which we know nothing of(*a*).

The third Argument his Lordſhip uſes, is taken from the Doxologies in Scripture: but theſe are all conſiſtent with the Glory due to the Obedience and Sufferings of the Lamb that was ſlain; and do by no means prove him incapable of laying aſide his Glory, and humbling himſelf; as the Scripture hath deſcribed.

At length the Biſhop, after labouring the point without ſucceſs, concludes; that, "if the Soul of *Chriſt* be *not* in Union with the divine *Logos*, it can only have a *human Nature*: except, as we ſaid, the *Logos* be his *Soul*; and then he has only the *divine Nature embodied*(*b*)."

Here his Lordſhip has granted at once, all that can be deſired; to ſhew, that his Hypotheſis is not wanted. For, if we put this laſt Objection into other words, it will run thus; except the *Logos* be his *Soul*; and then he will only be *God incarnate*:" [or *God*, manifeſt in the *Fleſh*:] for the *divine Nature embodied* muſt mean *God incarnate*. And this is ſufficient to explain every thing that is ſaid of this *Emmanuel*,

(*a*) Ib. p. 29. (*b*) Ib. 55.

plainly

plainly and literally through the whole New Teſtament; without recourſe to any far-fetched or unintelligible Hypotheſis, of *Two* Perſons made into *One*; or a Præexiſtence of the human Soul.

But, ſuppoſing both the *Præexiſtence* of the human Soul, and the *Union* of it with the Divinity, could be proved; yet the Difficulty, upon his Lordſhip's Hypotheſis, who ſuppoſes the *Logos* to be the *ſupreme* God, ſtill remains. His firſt Objection to the Deſcent of the *Logos*, before the Union with the Soul of *Chriſt*, was this: "How could He properly be ſaid to *come down* from Heaven; who could not for a Moment *be out* of Heaven, any more than *God* the *Father*?" P. 23, 24. And yet he aſſerts the *Deſcent* of the *eternal Word*, in *union* with the *Soul of* Chriſt, as a matter of no difficulty; [P. 53.] juſt as the ancient Fathers objected to *Apollinaris*, that *Chriſt* could not deſcend into Hell in his *Divine* Nature; and yet did accompany his *Soul* thither.

But here are *Two* unſurmountable Difficulties to the Hypotheſis; and to all of the like Nature.

Firſt; how the *third* Perſon of the *Trinity*, if he be *ſupreme* God, ſhould be capable of *local* Motion, without union with the human Soul; and not the *ſecond*: for I ſhould hope, the *Chriſtians* will not be ſo hardy as to deny the *literal* Deſcent of the *Holy Ghoſt* in Perſon; and tell us, that

that *He* alſo deſcended only *in impiis*, as they ſpeak of *Chriſt*'s Deſcent. And *Secondly*; how the *ſecond* Perſon ſhould become more capable of it, *after* the Union with the *Soul* of *Chriſt*; than he was before. Theſe two Objections are unanſwerable.

III. We are told in the New Teſtament; that *Chriſt* hath *ſuffered* for our Sins(*r*). But the *philoſophical* Divines have made this Doctrine incredible; by declaring him to be *ſelfexiſtent* and *impaſſible*. *Hilary* declares, as I have before obſerved (*s*); that He was free from all Pain, becauſe he was *God*: and Biſhop *Pearſon* ſays; the Sufferings of *Chriſt* were not the Sufferings of his *Deity*, but of his *Humanity*; for the *divine* Eſſence ſuffered not: which is the ſame thing as to confeſs, that the Sufferings were not undergone by *the Word*, who was in the beginning with God, and deſcended from Heaven; but by a *mere Man*, who had never been in Heaven.

IV. We are told, in the New Teſtament; that *Chriſt died* for us; and this ſeems to be the moſt fundamental Article of *Chriſtianity*; and yet this is denied by many of the *philoſophical* Divines: not indeed in direct words, but as they deny his *Sufferings*; that is, in obſcure and abſtruſe Terms: which, when explained, are capable of no other meaning. Biſhop *Pear-*

(*r*) I *Peter* iii. 18. (*s*) Letter I. p. 95; and Note XXV. p. 216.

ſon

ſon ſays; "although *Chriſt* was more than *Man*, (*i. e.* by the Conjunction with the *Logos*) yet he *died* no more than *Man* can die. A *Separation* was made between his *Soul* and *Body*; but no *Diſunion* to *them* and his *Deity*. The *Word* was once indeed without *Soul* or *Body*; but, after it was made *Fleſh*, it never parted from the one or the other(*t*)."

So then, it ſeems, the *Deity* was not ſeparated, either from the *Soul* or *Body*; and, if that be the Truth, the *Deity* who came down from Heaven, did not *die*; but only that part of him, which was *Human*, and had never deſcended from Heaven; that is, a mere Man.—And even *that* Part, which he ſays *did* die, yet he tells us, was never *ſeparated* from the Deity.

Thus, by the Divines, who are looked upon to be *Orthodox*, the *Deſcent* of *Chriſt* from Heaven is *denied*; under a Notion of his *Omnipreſence*, and incapacity of *local* Tranſition: his *Humiliation* is *denied*; by aſſerting his *Immutability*: his *Sufferings* are *denied*; by declaring his Subſtance to be *impaſſible*; and that he did not ſuffer in the *divine*, but only in the *human* Nature: and they *deny* his *Death*; under the Notion that the Deity was never ſeparated either from Soul or Body. All which Opinions end in *Socinianiſm*; and ſuppoſe, that the *Word* of *God*, which came down from Heaven, did not *ſuffer* and *die*; but a *mere*

(*t*) *Pearſon* on the Creed, p. 213.

Man. And herein they not only oppoſe the plain Doctrines of *Scripture*; but, what at other times they exalt as the Criterion of the *Chriſtian* Faith; I mean the Opinion of the *ancient Fathers:* and this they do, merely to maintain a Doctrine which was firſt decreed to be *Orthodox* at the Council of *Nice*, in 325; and had been condemned at *Antioch* as *Heretical*, about forty years before, by eighty Biſhops; in the Caſe of *Paulus Samoſatenus*.

I ſhould not have entered ſo far into this Argument; had it not been abſolutely neceſſary to clear my Subject from the Objections *à priori*, which ariſe from the *Homoouſian* Doctrine; before I undertook to lay before you the Evidence, upon which I embrace *Chriſtianity*. For, if *Chriſt* be the *ſupreme* God, as ſome Divines ſuppoſe; it is impoſſible to ſtir a ſingle ſtep forward in proof of his *Deſcent* from Heaven, His *Conception*, His *Humiliation*, His *Sufferings* and *Death*: All theſe things are *declared* of Him, in the *New Teſtament*, and *foretold* of Him in the *Old*: and all of them are abſolutely impoſſible to be undergone by a Being, that is *infinite*, *unchangeable*, and *impaſſible*.

And therefore, inſtead of attempting to explain the *Chriſtian* Syſtem by the Philoſophy of theſe Divines; I ſhall entirely neglect them: and truſt, (as the *Arian* and *Scripturarian* Heretics are accuſed of having done) to the Scriptures

tures only: following the Rule of *Hilary* entirely—

Non creditur Philoſophis: *creditur* Piſcatoribus.

See this Subject more fully examined in the VIIIth Letter, upon the Generation of *Jeſus Chriſt*.

The title of the ſecond chapter of *Euſebius*'s Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory is this, "A brief Summary "concerning the Præexiſtence and *Divinity*(*u*) "of our Lord and Saviour *Jeſus Chriſt*."

In this chapter, *Euſebius* calls *Chriſt* "the chief "Captain of the rational and immortal Hoſt in "Heaven; the Angel of the great Council; the "Miniſter(*x*) of the ſecret Will of the Father; "Maker and Worker of all Things together with "the Father; who, after the Father, is Cauſe "and Author of all Things; the true and only "begotten Son of God; *Lord*, *God*, and *King* "of all Creatures; receiving Dominion and "Rule from the Father, together with Divini-"ty(*y*), Power, and Honour; according to the "Myſtical and Divine Expreſſions of the Scrip-"ture concerning him: In the beginning was "the Word, &c. And great *Moſes* doth ſhew

(*u*) Θεολογιας. Here we ſee, that *Euſebius* underſtood the Divinity of *Chriſt* to be conſiſtent with all that follows of his miniſtring to the Father's commands, &c. but by no means to infer an Equality with the Father.

(*x*) υπεργον· ſome MSS. read τελειοην, finiſher.

(*y*) θεοτητι.

" the ſame, viz. that God the Father of the
" World and Architect of all, granted to *Chriſt*
" himſelf and to no other, *i. e.* to his divine and
" only begotten Word, the making of inferior
" Creatures, and that he conferred with him
" about the Creation of Man. He introduces
" the Father and Maker commanding as univerſal
" Lord with his royal beck; but the Word next
" to him, not different from him who is preach-
" ed by us in all things miniſtring to the Father's
" commands(z)—and he being in no wiſe ſloth-
" ful about his Father's Worſhip, was appointed
" a Maſter to teach all Men the Knowledge of
" his Father. The Lord God therefore appear-
" ed in the likeneſs of Man unto *Abraham*, as he
" ſat at the Oak of *Mamre*; but he forthwith
" falling down upon his face, although with the
" outward eye he beheld but Man, worſhipped
" him as God, and made Supplication to him as
" Lord. And that he was not ignorant who He
" was, he profeſſeth, when he uttered theſe words,
" O Lord, which judgeſt the earth, wilt thou
" not judge rightly?" For if it be contrary to
" reaſon that either the unbegotten or immuta-
" ble Subſtance(a) of God *Almighty* ſhould trans-
" form himſelf into the likeneſs of Man, and ſo
" by an Appearance in a bodily ſhape, deceive
" the eyes of the beholders, or that the Scrip-

(z) παίριναι; ἐπιταισξιν ὑπαρχῆλα. (a) ωσια.

" ture

" ture ſhould feign ſuch things falſely; then who
" elſe can be called that God and Lord that
" judgeth the whole Earth and executeth judg-
" ment, appearing *in the ſhape of Man*, but only
" his præ-exiſtent Word? (for is it not lawful
" to ſay it of the *firſt Author* of all things) the
" ſame of whom it is ſaid in the *Pſalm*, " He
" ſent his Word, and healed them," &c. The
" ſame *Moſes* called Lord next after the Father,
" *Gen.* xix. 24. " The Lord rained brimſtone
" and fire from the Lord out of Heaven,"
" whom the divine Scripture calleth God, *Gen.*
" xxxii. 28, 30. Moreover neither is it lawful
" once to ſurmiſe, that the apparitions of God
" in the Scripture may be all attributed to the
" inferior Angels and Miniſters of God: for if
" any of them appeared unto Men, the Scripture
" doth not conceal the ſame expreſsly; not ſay-
" ing that *God* or *the Lord*, but that *Angels* ſpake;
" as may be confirmed by innumerable Teſti-
" monies. This ſame Perſon alſo doth *Jeſus* the
" ſucceſſor of *Moſes* term the chief Captain of
" the great power of the Lord; as Prince of
" celeſtial Angels and Archangels, and all ſuper-
" natural Powers; as being the Power and
" Wiſdom of the Father; and to whom the ſe-
" cond place of the Rule and Government of all
" Things is committed, when as he beheld him
" in no other form or figure than of Man; for
" thus it is written, *Joſ.* v. 13, 14. By theſe

" words

" words thou mayeſt perceive that this Perſon " did not differ from him who delivered his Ora- " cles to *Moſes*: for of him alſo the Scripture " ſpeaketh the ſame words. *Ex.* iii. 4, 5, 6(*b*)."

(*b*) *Valeſius* in this place quotes an ancient Scholion, referred-to in the Note in p. 354. The Scholion is as follows, " The Church, O holy *Euſebius*, thinks otherwiſe concerning this, and not as thou doſt: For the Church concludes Him who appeared to *Moſes* in the Buſh to be God; but him who appeared to *Moſes'* ſucceſſor in *Jericho*, to whom the Preſidency of the *Hebrews* was allotted, who had his ſword drawn, and commanded *Joſhua* to put off his Shoe, Him, I ſay, the Church ſuppoſes to be *Michael* the Archangel. And it is manifeſt, it thinks righter than thou. Whence is this gathered? God, who appeared in the form of fire, being aſked by his Servant *Moſes* who he was; moſt evidently declared this unto him, that he was God. But he that appears to *Joſhua*, in no wiſe ſtyles himſelf God; but calls himſelf God's chief Captain. But this dignity being inferior to the Supreme Power and Divinity, and being not regal but belonging to a General, as one would ſay" * * * * * * * * The reſt of the MS. is illegible.

Upon this reaſoning I would obſerve, firſt, that the word God is not only uſed of *Jehovah* himſelf, but alſo of his Angel, in whom he put his Name, and who was therefore called by his Name, as he is in this chapter.—2d. that the Perſon who appeared in the Buſh is called the Angel of *Jehovah* in the 2d verſe, which is a title inferior to the Supreme Power and Divinity, and is never given to the Supreme God and Father of all.—3d. that as this ſame Perſon is called by the Name of *Jehovah*, it can mean no other than the *Jehovah Angel* in whom the ſupreme *Jehovah* had put his Name; or the *Logos*, ſuppoſed to be called the Captain of God's Hoſt and Michael. See Note (*t*), Letter III. p. 353, " Mr. Ainſworth," &c.

Now

Now that there is a certain Subſtance, [ουσιαν] living and ſubſiſting before the foundations of the world were laid, which miniſtred to the Father and God of all, at the Creation of all Creatures, termed the Word or Wiſdom of God, ſee *Prov.* viii. 12, 15, 16—22, 23, &c.

Euſebius farther ſays; "when the Wickedneſs "of the World was come to a height, then the "præ-exiſtent Word, out of his abundant lov-"ing kindneſs unto men, appeared ſometimes "by Viſion of Angels, unto the inhabitants of "earth; ſometimes by himſelf, as the ſaving "Power of God unto one or two of the ancients, "which were beloved of God, in no other form "than that of a *Man*, for otherwiſe it could not "have been. Afterwards He, by the prophet "*Moſes*, delivered figures and ſigns of Circum-"ciſion, &c. Afterwards the ſame Perſon ma-"nifeſted himſelf about the beginning of the "*Roman* Empire in Human Shape, and therein "wrought ſuch things as were conſonant with "the oracles of the Prophets. The Prophet "*Daniel* by divine Spirit, beholding his King-"dom which ſhall be in the latter age of the "world, hath thus deſcribed the Viſion of God, "*Dan.* vii. 7, 9, 10, 13, 14. Theſe things mani-"feſtly can be referred to none other, than to "our Saviour, the Word that was in the begin-"ning with God, God the Word, termed the Son "of Man by reaſon of his Incarnation in the "later times."

End of the THIRD LETTER.

LETTER THE FOURTH.

Profecto aderit Tempus, cum *Judæi* in rectam ſemitam reducentur; qui nunc errant miſere, ignorantia viæ. Nondum omnes dierum Soles occiderunt: Fulgebit illis quoque iterum ſua Lux. Cecidiſſe eos, non Excidiſſe, certum eſt.

CUNÆUS, de Rep. *Hebr.* p. 113.

I HAVE given you my Reaſons already, in my ſecond Letter; why I believe the *Angel of the Covenant* to be the *Meſſiah:* and I am now to ſhew, upon what Evidence I believe the ſame Perſon to be *that* JESUS; whom the *Chriſtians* acknowledge to be *the* CHRIST: that he came into the World, according to the Promiſe which he made to our Fathers in the Perſon of the Viſible *Jehovah*, "to make *a new Covenant with the houſe of*

Iſrael, *and with the houſe of* Judah(*a*); within the time limited by the Prophets for the *Meſſiah*'s Advent; and in that afflicted ſtate, in which he is ſometimes repreſented in *our* Scriptures; and was deſpiſed, and rejected, and put to Death, by the Rulers of *our* Nation; but was received by the *Gentiles*, and many of *our* Fathers; who were *gathered* to him, as their Lord and King: and began to ſet-up that Kingdom, which is to rule over all; and is to laſt to the End of Ages.

I am ſatisfied, you have no more doubt than I have, of the Truth of what is aſſerted by *Maimonides* and *Abravanel*; that the coming of the *Meſſiah* is declared in the Law and the Prophets(*b*): and all the Prophets, from *Moſes* to *Malachi*,

(*a*) *Jer.* xxxi. 31. compared with *Zech.* ii. 10, 11.

(*b*) See *Abravanel* de Cap. Fidei, cap. xiv. where he gives his Reaſons, why *Maimonides* conſidered the coming of the *Meſſiah* as an Article of Faith; and particularly Rat. 3. Quia adventus *Meſſiæ* expoſitus erat in Lege, Prophetis, & Hagiographis. Dominus enim noſter *Moſes*, & omnes Prophetæ qui eum conſecuti ſunt, de *illo* teſtantur; & qui hoc modo locuti ſunt per Spiritum S. omnes illi conveniunt, prænunciant, atque loquuntur de adventu Regis *Meſſiæ*: Sicuti etiam idem probavi perfectâ atque perſpicuâ demonſtratione, in Tract. *Schamiah Jeſcherha*, quem de adventu *Meſſiæ* concinnavi. Quapropter qui negat ejus adventum, certe is negat ipſam Legem, Prophetas, atque Hagiographos; quia iſti omnes de eo teſtati ſunt. Et propter hanc probationem oportet hanc Fidem numerare inter articulos Legis.

Sed

Malachi, have propheſied of ſcarce any thing elſe. Nor can it be denied; that, about the time when *Jeſus* appeared, there was a very high Expectation; that ſome one from *Judæa* ſhould gain the dominion over all. For the Truth of this, we have not only the Authority of the *Chriſtian* Scriptures; but alſo of *Sueto-nius*, *Tacitus*, and *Joſephus*.

The words of *Joſephus* are theſe(*c*); "That which chiefly excited them [i. e. the *Jews*] to this war, was an ambiguous Propheſy, which was ALSO found in the Sacred Writings; that, about that time, ſome one of them from their Country would rule the World. For this they underſtood to relate to their own Nation(*d*); and

See alſo *Poli* Synopſ. ad *Dan.* ix. 24. p. 1520. In *Talmud* ſic ſcribunt;—Omnes Prophetæ vaticinati ſunt de diebus *Meſſiæ*. *Talm. Helv.* n. 93.—*Beracoth*, c. i. fol. 3. *Sanhed.* c. xi.

(*c*) *Joſephus* de Bell. *Jud.* lib. VI. c. v. 4. Τὸ δὲ ἐπάρας αὐτὺς μάλιστα πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἦν Χρησμὸς ἀμφίβολος ὁμοίως ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐυρημένος γράμμασιν, ὡς κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας τις αὐτῶν ἄρξει τῆς οἰκουμένης· τοῦτο οἱ μὲν ὡς οἰκεῖον ἐξέλαβον· καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν σόφων ἐπλανήθησαν περὶ τὴν κρίσιν. Ἐδήλου δ' ἄρα περὶ τῦ Ουεσπασιανῦ τὸ λόγιον, ἡγεμονίαν ἀποδειχθέντος ἐπὶ Ἰουδαίας αὐτοκράτορος, &c.

(*d*) This being the fact; that the *Jews* interpreted this Propheſy to concern themſelves; *(ſibi interpretate, & ad ſe trahentes)* which they had good reaſon to do, from many other Propheſies in the Scriptures; I cannot ſee why the Biſhop of *Lichfield* and *Coventry*, Dr. *Chandler*,

and many wiſe Men were deceived with the Interpretation. But in truth, *Veſpaſian*'s Empire was deſigned in this propheſy; who was crëated Emperor in *Judæa*."

Tacitus ſays; moſt of them, [the *Jews*] had a Notion, that it was contained in the ancient Books of the Prieſts; that at that very time, [*viz.* when *Jeruſalem* was beſieged] the Eaſt ſhould grow powerful; and ſome from *Judæa* ſhould gain the Dominion; &c(*e*)."

Suetonius ſays; " an old and conſtant opinion had been received, and prevailed all over the Eaſt; that it was decreed by the Fates that at *that* time *Judæa* ſhould gain the Dominion over all:" and adds; " the *Jews*, taking that to regard themſelves, which appeared by the Event to be predicted of the *Roman* Empire, rebelled(*f*)."

The

has tranſlated the word ἐιλαμβάνειν, to receive by Tradition. *Scapula* explains it by *percipio, excipio*; i. e. *interpretor, intelligo. Tacitus* ſays, *more humanæ Cupidinis*; *i. e.* their *Wiſhes were the Father to that* Interpretation. But *Tradition* was quite out of the Queſtion.

(*e*) Pluribus perſuaſio inerat, *antiquis Sacerdotum* libris contineri; eo ipſo tempore fore, ut valeſceret Oriens; profectique *Judæâ* rerum potirentur. Quæ ambages *Veſpaſianum & Titum* prædixerunt. Sed *Vulgus*, more humanæ cupidinis, *Sibi* tantam Fatorum magnitudinem *interpretati*, ne adverſis quidem ad vera mutantur. Hiſt. lib. V. c. xiii.

(*f*) Percrebuerat Oriente toto vetus & conſtans Opinio; eſſe in Fatis, ut eo tempore *Judæâ* profecti rerum poti-

The Account here given us, ſhews; that either theſe two *Romans* had the Hiſtory of *Joſephus* before them: or elſe, that there were then extant ſome other Writings; which were conſulted by them all three. This appears not only from their ſaying the ſame thing in ſo ſimilar a manner, but from the very words themſelves; *Sibi interpretati*, and *ad ſe trahentes*, being each of them a tranſlation of ὡς οἰκεῖον ἑξελαβον. And neither of them refer primarily to the original Propheſy, nor to any private Hiſtory; but to common Fame. *Tacitus* ſays, moſt of the *Jews* had a Notion; &c. *Suetonius* ſays, it was an old and conſtant Opinion that prevailed: and even *Joſephus* does not refer immediately to the ſacred Books; but to an ambiguous Propheſy, which was *alſo* [ὁμοίως] found in the *ſacred* Books. So that they all agree, that it was a common Report; and ſaid to be contained in the *ſacred* Books.

It has been much diſputed; *what* ſacred Books they were, which the *Roman* Authors here refer to; and imagined by ſome to have been the Books of the *Sibylls:* becauſe it is ſuppoſed; that they ſpake of a King, who was to rule the World; and to conquer the *Parthians:* and becauſe all the other prophetic

potirentur. Id de Imperio *Romano*, quantum poſtea Eventu patuit, prædictum, *Judæi* ad ſe trahentes rebellarunt. *Veſp.* cap. iv.

Writings

and many wiſe Men were deceived with the Interpretation. But in truth, *Veſpaſian*'s Empire was deſigned in this propheſy; who was creäted Emperor in *Judæa*."

Tacitus ſays; moſt of them, [the *Jews*] had a Notion, that it was contained in the ancient Books of the Prieſts; that at that very time, [*viz.* when *Jeruſalem* was beſieged] the Eaſt ſhould grow powerful; and ſome from *Judæa* ſhould gain the Dominion; &c(*e*)."

Suetonius ſays; " an old and conſtant opinion had been received, and prevailed all over the Eaſt; that it was decreed by the Fates that at *that* time *Judæa* ſhould gain the Dominion over all:" and adds; " the *Jews*, taking that to regard themſelves, which appeared by the Event to be predicted of the *Roman* Empire, rebelled(*f*)."

The

has tranſlated the word ἐκλαμβάνειν, to receive by Tradition. *Scapula* explains it by *percipio, excipio*; i. e. *interpretor, intelligo*. *Tacitus* ſays, *more humanæ Cupidinis*; *i. e.* their *Wiſhes were the Father to that* Interpretation. But *Tradition* was quite out of the Queſtion.

(*e*) Pluribus perſuaſio inerat, *antiquis Sacerdotum* libris contineri; eo ipſo tempore fore, ut valeſceret Oriens; profectique *Judæâ* rerum potirentur. Quæ ambages *Veſpaſianum & Titum* prædixerunt. Sed *Vulgus*, more humanæ cupidinis, *Sibi* tantam Fatorum magnitudinem *interpretati*, ne adverſis quidem ad vera mutantur. Hiſt. lib. V. c. xiii.

(*f*) Percrebuerat Oriente toto vetus & conſtans Opinio; eſſe in Fatis, ut eo tempore *Judæâ* profecti rerum poti-

The Account here given us, ſhews; that either theſe two *Romans* had the Hiſtory of *Joſephus* before them: or elſe, that there were then extant ſome other Writings; which were conſulted by them all three. This appears not only from their ſaying the ſame thing in ſo ſimilar a manner, but from the very words themſelves; *Sibi interpretati*, and *ad ſe trahentes*, being each of them a tranſlation of ὡς οἰκεῖον ἐξενεγκάμενον. And neither of them refer primarily to the original Propheſy, nor to any private Hiſtory; but to common Fame. *Tacitus* ſays, moſt of the *Jews* had a Notion; &c. *Suetonius* ſays, it was an old and conſtant Opinion that prevailed: and even *Joſephus* does not refer immediately to the ſacred Books; but to an ambiguous Propheſy, which was *alſo* [ὁμοίως] found in the *ſacred* Books. So that they all agree, that it was a common Report; and ſaid to be contained in the *ſacred* Books.

It has been much diſputed; *what* ſacred Books they were, which the *Roman* Authors here refer to; and imagined by ſome to have been the Books of the *Sibylls:* becauſe it is ſuppoſed; that they ſpake of a King, who was to rule the World; and to conquer the *Parthians:* and becauſe all the other prophetic

potirentur. Id de Imperio *Romano*, quantum poſtea Eventu patuit, prædictum, *Judæi* ad ſe trahentes rebellarunt. *Veſp.* cap. iv.

Writings

Writings among the *Romans* were looked-upon to be ſpurious; and ordered to be burned, in the days of *Auguſtus*(*g*): and chiefly, becauſe both *Suetonius* and *Tacitus* ſpeak of the *Sibylline* Oracles, under the Titles of *Libri Fatales*, and *Libri Pontificum*.

Suetonius tells us, in the Life of *Julius Cæſar*, of an uncertain Rumour; that *L. Cotta*, one of the *Quindecimviri*, intended to opine at the next meeting of the Senate, that *Cæſar* ſhould be called King; becauſe it was contained in the *Libri Fatales*, that the *Parthians* could not be conquered; except by a *King*(*h*). And *Dio*, ſpeaking of the ſame affair, ſays; there went a report, that the *Quindecimviri* had divulged, that the *Sibyll* had declared, the *Parthians* could not be conquered, except by a *King*(*i*).—What *Suetonius* therefore here calls *Libri Fatales*(*k*), *Dio* calls the Books of the *Sibylls*:

(*g*) *Solos retinuit* Sibyllinos, *hos quoque delectu habito*; *condiditque duobus forulis aureis ſub* Palatini Apollinis *baſi*. *Suet. Aug. p.* 31.

(*h*) *Appellandum quoque eſſe Regem*; *ſi ſalvi eſſe vellemus*. Cic. de Divin. II. c. liv. Suet. Jul. p. 79. See the Biſhop of *Lichfield* and *Coventry*; p. 472, &c.

(*i*) Λόγος διελθόντος ὡς τῶν ἱερίων τῶν ἐς καλυμένων διαθρούλων ὅτι ἡ Σίβυλλα ἐίρηκῦα εἴη, μήποθε τὰς Παρθὰς ἄλλως πως πλὴν ὑπὸ βασιλέως ἁλῶναι. *Dio*. lib. XLIV.

(*k*) *Livy*, lib. XXII. ch. lvii. uſes the ſame expreſſion for the *Sibylline* Books; Decemviri libros adire juſſi ſunt —Interim ex *fatalibus* libris ſacrificia aliquot extraordinaria

Sibylls: and they farther appear to have been the ſame, becauſe they were both under the Care of the *Quindecimviri*; who preſerved no others.

Tacitus(*l*) ſays; after the unexpected Death of *Julius Cæſar*, who was ſuppoſed to be propheſied-of in the *Sibylls'* books, as the King who ſhould conquer the *Parthians*; it began to be ſuſpected, that ſome ſpurious Pieces were gotten abroad; under the celebrated names of the *Sibylls:* and *Tiberius* very ſeverely reprimanded *Gallus* the *Quindecimvir*; for getting one of the *Sibylls'* books to be received in a thin Senate, before it had paſſed the examination of the College of the fifteen Prieſts—Theſe therefore were the ſame Books, which *Suetonius* here calls *Libri Fatales.*

Let us now conſider; what books they were, which *Joſephus* here refers-to. For as theſe three Writers all refer us to ſome *ſacred* Books, in which this Propheſy was contained; it is probable, that they all refer to the ſame books: though the *Romans* might not know, what books they were. However, it is by no means to be ſuppoſed; that *Joſephus* ſhould call the *Sibylline* Oracles by *that Name.* For the *Jews*

naria facta, and ch. x. This was in the ſecond *Punic* War; when theſe Books were under the care of the *Decimviri.*

(*l*) *Tacit.* Annal. VI. 12.

neither

neither looked-upon them to be *ſacred*; nor, if this report had ariſen from *them*, would they have paid any regard to it; much leſs have made it an occaſion of Rebellion. And the Caſe was the ſame, with the other Eaſtern Nations; who would have received no Propheſy, that was not *ancient* and *conſtant* in *their own* Country; and ſupported by the Authority of *their own* Prieſts. Now *Daniel*, in whoſe Writings this Propheſy is ſtill extant; was conſtituted Maſter of the *Magi* by *Nebuchadnezzar*, about the year 600 before *Chriſt*; and gave out the Propheſy of *Meſſiah* the Prince, who ſhould reign over all, in the firſt year of *Darius* the *Mede*; [*Dan.* ix. 1.] and the *Magi* were the eſtabliſhed Prieſts of the *Perſian* Empire(*m*).

(*m*) *Magi*, ſays *Suidas*, is the *Perſic* word for *Prieſts*. Μάγοι παρὰ Πέρσαις οἱ φιλόσοφοι καὶ φιλόθεοι· and *Heſychius* writes, *Majum a* Perſis *vocari* τὸν Θεοσεβῆ καὶ Θεόλογον καὶ Ἱερέα· and *Plato* interprets *Magia*, Θεῶν θεράπεια. They pretended to Propheſy, and to a particular Intimacy with the Supreme Being; as we are told by *Diogenes Laertius*, in the Pröem: and therefore it is not probable, they would neglect the opportunity of gaining a Reputation; by eſpouſing the Propheſies of *Daniel*, their *Archimagus*: and preſerving ſuch extraordinary marks of the divine favour towards the head of their own ſect. And this, by the way, will account for the preſents made by the *Magi*, who were at *Jeruſalem*, at the Expiration of *Daniel*'s ſeventy weeks; ſaying, Where is He, that is born King of the *Jews*? for we have ſeen his Star ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, and are come to worſhip Him. *Matt.* ii. 2.

But,

But, however this may be, *Joſephus* has explained his own meaning; and told us, that by the *Sacred Writings* he means the holy Scriptures. "If any man, ſays he, be ſo curious as to enquire into theſe things; [*i. e.* future Events;] and to underſtand ſuch matters as are hidden: let him read the Book of *Daniel*; which he will find among the Sacred Writings(*n*).—The Sacred Writings, therefore, which *Joſephus* refers-to, is that Collection of Writings; among which the Book of *Daniel* is to be found: and indeed there could be no other writings, which *Joſephus* would honour with ſuch a Title; notwithſtanding this Propheſy might alſo have been preſerved among the Writings of the *Magi*, and might from thence have ſpread abroad through the Eaſtern Countries: which will account for *Joſephus'* making uſe of the word ὁμοίως. It was an ambiguous Propheſy, or a Propheſy of doubtful Interpretation; which was ALSO found in the holy Scriptures. So that we need go no farther to find what the Propheſy is, to which he refers; if it be contained in the Propheſies of *Daniel*. And therefore when *Suetonius* and *Tacitus* refer us, as *Joſephus* does, to ſome ſacred Books in which this Propheſy was contained; it ſeems to be very probable, that they either copied from *Joſephus*, or from ſome other

(*n*) *Joſ.* Ant. l. X. c. x. § 4.

Writer; without knowing, where the Original Sacred Writings were to be found. And though it would be very reaſonable to conclude; that the *Roman* Writers would have intended the Books of the *Sibylls*, by the words *Libri Fatales*, &c. if they had been ſpeaking of a Report propagated at *Rome*; yet, when they are ſpeaking of a Propheſy, which prevailed in the Eaſt, and was believed by the *Jews*; the *Sibylline* Oracles muſt be out of the Queſtion: and the *Romans* muſt be ſuppoſed to ſpeak of ſuch Books; as were held ſacred in the Eaſtern Countries, and among the *Jews*.

We find, that the Propheſies of the *Cumæan Sibyl* were burned with the Capitol in the time of *Sylla*, U. C. 671; in the year 82 before the *Chriſtian* Æra: and, as no copy was taken of them, neither *Suetonius* nor *Tacitus* could know any thing of their Contents. Soon after this, in the year 67, upon a motion which *Curio* the Conſul made in the Senate, other Propheſies of the *Sibylls* were diligently ſought out, and brought to *Rome*; as we find by *Feneſtella*, cited by *Lactantius* (*o*): for which purpoſe *Gabinius*, *Octacilius*, and *Valerius*, were ſent to *Erythræ*, *Samos*, &c. who brought about 1000 verſes; and they were placed in the Capitol: and many, which were received at that time, were rejected afterwards. Now we have no argument for the

(*o*) *Simpſoni* Chron. Cath. p. vii. p. 74.

Authen-

Authenticity of any of theſe, but the deciſion of the *Quindecimviri* (*p*); who were to judge, whether they were genuine or no: and ſometimes ſeveral of theſe Judges were not preſent at the Examination.—This being the Caſe, it does not ſeem to be at all material to the cauſe of *Chriſtianity*; whether the Propheſy, that the *Parthians* could not be conquered, except by a *King*, was in the *Sibylline* Books; or not. Nor can I ſee any advantage from confounding that Propheſy (which even the *Romans* looked upon as a forgery) with the plain and determinate Propheſies in *Daniel*, of a Prince who ſhould reign over all and the Teſtimony of theſe three Writers; which amounts to a proof, that this was an old and conſtant opinion all over the Eaſt; and contained in their Sacerdotal Books. For this in truth is all the queſtion the *Chriſtians* are concerned in. As to the *Sibylline* Books; they were probably either all forged, or elſe taken from the Propheſies of the Old Teſtament: For nothing could be more eaſy, than to put thoſe Propheſies into another form; and then paſs them off upon the world as Originals: and I am afraid, there have been times, when neither *Jews* nor *Chriſtians* would have ſcrupled it, to ſerve their Cauſe(*q*).—But to

(*p*) *Dato Sacerdotibus negotio, quantum humana ope potuiſſent vera diſcernere. Tac.* An. VI. 12.

(*q*) *Greg. Naz.* in his poem to *Nemeſius* ſays. that *Hermes Triſmegiſtus*, and *Sibylla*, whatever they predicted

to go on; If there be any Propheſy of theſe things in the Scripture, prior to the Events referred to, concerning *God*, did not foretell theſe things by divine Inſpiration, but had them out of the Sacred Books of the *Hebrews*, which they had incidentally perused; and *Valeſius* ſays; theſe verſes concerning *Chriſt*, were made by idle People, and publiſhed about the times of the Emperor *Adrian*. And *Celſus*, who lived under *Mar. Antoninus*; affirms that the Chriſtians had inſerted many things into the *Sibylline* oracles. See *Valeſius'* Note, in the 18th ch. of *Conſtantine's* Oration, p. 652.

The Propheſy of a King, that ſhould conquer the *Parthians*; might be framed from the Scriptures, that a King was to reign over all: and thus the Story of *Aſtyages'* Dream, relating to his Grandſon *Cyrus'* becoming a Lord of all *Aſia*; recorded by *Juſtin* [l. I. c. iv.] and the Oracle's anſwer to *Cræſus*, that, if he paſſed the *Halys*, he ſhould deſtroy a great Government; [in the *Clio* of *Herodotus*] and the Propheſy of *Nebuchadnezzar*, mentioned by *Megaſthenes*, that a *Perſian Mule* ſhould conquer the *Babylonians*; might alſo be framed: without imagining the Heathens received their Intelligence from Superior Beings. For the Scripture Propheſies, that the *Medes* and *Perſians* ſhould conquer *Babylon*, were much earlier than the Days of *Aſtyages:* and *Cyrus* is mentioned in them as a great Conqueror; as we find by the following Texts. *Iſ.* xiii. 17. "Behold, I will ſtir up the *Medes* againſt them; which ſhall not regard Silver, and as for Gold they ſhall not delight in it: Their Bows ſhall alſo daſh the young Men to pieces, and they ſhall have no pity on the fruit of the Womb; their Eye ſhall not ſpare Children. And *Babylon*, the Glory of Kingdoms, the Beauty of the *Chaldees'* Excellency, ſhall be as when God overthrew *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*; &c." And *Jeremiah*, li. 11, ſays; "Make bright

ferred-to; it is of very little conſequence, whether we can or cannot account how the *Sibylline* Pro-

bright the Arrows, gather the Shields; the Lord hath raiſed-up the Spirit of the Kings of the *Medes:* for his Device is againſt *Babylon*, to deſtroy it." And again, ver. 27, 28. "Call together againſt her the Kingdoms of *Ararat*, *Minni*, [or *Armenia*;] and *Aſchenaz*, [or *Phrygia Minor*—See Sir *Iſaac Newton*'s Chronology; p. 323.] appoint a Captain againſt her; cauſe the Horſes to come up as the rough Caterpillars; prepare againſt her the Nations; with the Kings of the *Medes*, the Captains thereof, and all the Rulers thereof, and all the Land of his Dominion." And *Iſaiah*, in another Propheſy, [*Iſ.* xxi. 2.] ſays; "A grievous Viſion is declared unto me; the treacherous dealer dealeth treacherouſly, and the ſpoiler ſpoileth; go up, O *Elam!* [or *Perſia*] beſiege, O *Media!* all the ſighing thereof have I made to ceaſe." And this Viſion includes the Deſtruction of *Babylon*, in the 9th verſe.

And all this may eaſily be collected to relate to *Cyrus*, from his being mentioned *by Name* as a great Conqueror; and God's declaring, that he led him by the hand to Victory. "Thus ſaith the Lord to his Anointed; to *Cyrus*, whoſe right hand I have holden to ſubdue Nations before him; and I will looſe the loins of Kings to open before him the two leaved Gates, and the Gates ſhall not be ſhut: I will go before Thee, and make the crooked places ſtraight; and I will break in peices the gates of Braſs, and cut in ſunder the bars of Iron; and I will give Thee the treaſures of Darkneſs, and hidden riches of ſecret places; that thou mayeſt know, that I the Lord, who call thee by thy Name, am the God of *Iſrael*. For *Jacob* my Servant's ſake, and *Iſrael* mine Elect, I have even called Thee by thy Name; I have ſurnamed Thee, though thou haſt not known Me." *Iſ.* xlv. Now theſe Propheſies were given, ſeveral years before

Propheſies were underſtood by theſe *Romans*; or from whence they received the Accounts they give

before either *Cyrus* or *Aſtyages* were born: and in them we ſee ſufficient *Data*, on which to found the dream of *Aſtyages*; and the Interpretation of it, with regard to the Conqueſts of *Cyrus*.

As to what *Megaſthenes* ſays of *Nebuchadnezzar*'s Propheſy, that *Cyrus* ſhould reign over *Babylon*; *Nebuchadnezzar* might have collected it from the Propheſies already mentioned, and the great Character and Station of *Cyrus*; [who was then 38 years of age, and Brother-in-law to *Darius* the *Median* [and particularly from the xlivth Chapter of *Iſaiah*, where God ſpeaketh of Himſelf as "Him that confirmeth the Word [or Propheſy] of his Servant, and performeth the Counſel of his Meſſengers; [ver. 26, 27, 28.] that ſaith to *Jeruſalem*, Thou ſhalt be inhabited; and to the Cities of *Judah*, Ye ſhall be built; and I will raiſe up the decayed Places thereof; that ſaith to the Deep, Be dry, and I will dry-up thy Rivers; that ſaith of *Cyrus*, He is my Shepherd, and ſhall perform all my pleaſure; even ſaying to *Jeruſalem*, Thou ſhalt be built; and to the Temple, Thy foundation ſhall be laid." And ch. xlv. 13. ſpeaking again of *Cyrus*, he ſaith; "I have raiſed him up in Righteouſneſs, and will direct all his ways: he ſhall build my City, and he ſhall let go my Captives, not for Price nor Reward; ſaith the Lord of Hoſts."

Now this was as remarkable a Propheſy as *Cyrus*'s Conqueſts to *Nebuchadnezzar*; who had deſtroyed *Jeruſalem*, and the Temple, and then held the People captive; as could poſſibly be expreſſed: For he muſt know, that *Cyrus* could have no power to looſe the *Jewiſh* Captives at *Babylon*, or to build-up the Cities of *Judah* and *Jeruſalem*; except He ſhould be Maſter of the Kingdom of the *Babyloians*.

If

give us. And therefore, as Dr. *Sykes* juſtly obſerves; "let the Book of *Daniel* be mangled, or

If it be aſked, how *Nebuchadnezzar* came to call *Cyrus* a *Perſian Mule*; it may be anſwered, It does not appear that he did ſo. *Cyrus* was his *Perſian* name; and the ſame by which he is called by *Iſaiah*, and ſpoken-of as a great Conqueror; and probably was the Name by which his Uncle *Nebuchadnezzar* ſpake of him, as the Conqueror of *Babylon*. But the name *Cyrus*, which in the *Perſian* language ſignifies a *Mule*, might be tranſlated ſo by the Hiſtorians; and thence the Story aroſe of a *Perſian Mule*. And this conjecture is confirmed by other inſtances; particularly in that the ſame miſtake has happened in relation to *Spaco*, the Nurſe of *Cyrus*. *Spaco* in *Perſia* ſignifies a *Bitch*; and we find her Story told by the *Greeks*, under the name Κυνω; and ſo *Cyrus* is ſaid to have been nurſed by a *Bitch*.

It is probable, that he was called *Cyrus*; becauſe he was born of a *Mede* and *Perſian*. For though it was cuſtomary for the Royal Families of thoſe times to intermarry with the neighbouring Nations; it was cuſtomary among the *Perſians* to marry within themſelves: which might make an external marriage the more remarkable.

As I am now upon probable Conjectures only, I ſhall venture to add in this Place a very remarkable Circumſtance in *Herodotus*'s account of the Conqueſt of *Cræſus* by *Cyrus*; with a Solution of it from the Book of *Daniel*. *Herodotus* tells us; that one Reaſon why *Cræſus*, was condemned to the flames by *Cyrus*, was this; becauſe he had learned, that He was Θεοσεβης, a religious man; or a worſhipper of the Gods; and had a mind to ſee, whether any of them would preſerve him.—This was in the year before *Chriſt* 544; *Shadrac*, *Meſhech*, and *Abednego* were carried captive with *Daniel* to *Babylon* in the year 598, fifty-four years before; and were preſerved by the Power of God, when

made-up by the *Sanhedrim*, out of Papers left by *Daniel*; or let it be written as late as 200 years before *Chriſt*, as *Porphyry* vainly imagined; (Objections which the Dr. had juſt before conſidered:) yet ſtill my Obſervation is good; that in this Book is an *expreſs* and *clear Propheſy* of a *Kingdom*, which God was to erect. And were

when caſt into the fiery Furnace, at the Court of *Cyrus*'s Uncle, *Nebuchadnezzar*; when *Cyrus* was a Child in *Perſia*; and *Nebuchadnezzar* upon this Account made a Decree, in which it was declared, that no other God could deliver after that ſort. *Dan.* iii. 29. Now *Cyrus*, who was about fifty-five years of Age at the Conqueſt of *Cræſus*, knowing that *Cræſus* was famous through the World for his Preſents to the Temples of the Heathen Gods; might be willing to try, whether the Gods of *Cræſus* were not as powerful and propitious to their Worſhippers; as *Jehovah*, the God of the *Jews*. And in this Light, the action of *Cyrus* was natural enough; in a Country, where ſuch Cruelty was not uncommon. But if *Cyrus* had never heard of any ſuch Deliverance of pious Men, by the divine Interpoſition; it muſt appear to be an extravagant and unaccountable thing, unworthy of the Character of ſo great and wiſe a Prince: or that the Hiſtorian ſhould mention ſuch a ſtrange Story.—It is very remarkable; that, in the whole Diſcourſe of *Daniel* to *Nebuchadnezzar*, he never once attempts to declare the *Unity* of the Lord *Jehovah*; but only his *Supremacy:* which was the Queſtion *Cyrus* ſeems deſirous of trying; *i. e.* whether any of the Gods of *Cræſus* was as powerful as the God of the *Jews*. This was a queſtion, which he might think to be of ſufficient Conſequence to excuſe the way he undertook to ſolve it: eſpecially, if he really believed his Gods would ſave him; as the God of *Iſrael* had ſaved his Worſhippers.

this

this only to be conſidered, a ſufficient Foundation is laid for that ancient and conſtant opinion, that one from *Judæa* was to ariſe, and to obtain a dominion over all. And thoſe, who would deſtroy the Credibility of the Goſpel, muſt in ſome manner or other ſhew; that there is not a ſufficient foundation in the Scripture, for the Expectation of the *Meſſiah*—or deny the Credibility of the miraculous Works which *Jeſus* performed—or refute the Accounts of his Reſurrection. Theſe being the Evidences produduced by Our Saviour, that he was what he pretended to be(*r*)."

The Propheſies of *Daniel*, as Sir *Iſaac Newton* obſerves, were in the greateſt repute among the *Jews*; till the reign of the *Roman* Emperor *Hadrian*(*s*). And Dr. *Allix* informs us; that *R. Eliezer*, who lived under *Trajan*, obſerved: that the Reading the Old Teſtament made the *Jews* turn *Heretics*; i. e. *Chriſtians:* himſelf being ſuſpected of being inclinable that way. So that in after-times they perferred much the Study of the *Miſhna*, that is to ſay, of their Traditions; before that of the Law itſelf(*t*)." And thus the Prophet *Daniel* got out of Repute, more than the reſt; "being the moſt diſtinct

(*r*) *Sykes'* Preface to an Eſſay on the Truth, &c. p. xiv.—And Eſſay, p. 27, &c. (*s*) Sir *Iſaac Newton*, on the Propheſies of *Daniel*; p. 25. (*t*) *Allix'* Judgement of the *Jewiſh* Church; p. 326.

in order of Time, and eaſieſt to be underſtood: and to reject his Propheſies, is to reject the *Chriſtian* Religion. For this Religion is founded upon his Propheſy concerning the *Meſſiah*(*u*);" But, in the time of *Joſephus*, this Prophet was in the higheſt Repute: and he himſelf gives very large Atteſtations to his writings and character. He calls him "one of the greateſt Prophets(*x*);" and ſays, "the Spirit of God was "in him; and the books which he hath written "and left behind him, are, even to this time, "read among us; and we believe, from the "accounts we there find, that he had intercourſe "with God(*y*);" and a little farther on he quotes his Propheſies, as a Proof, that the *Epicureans* were miſtaken, in excluding Providence from the Government of the World, becauſe, if there *were* no *Providence*, there *could be* no *Propheſy*. And he tells us; that *Daniel* did not only propheſy future Events, as *other* Prophets did; but alſo determined the *Time*, when they ſhould come to paſs. And by this laſt obſervation he directs us to ſearch in the Book of *Daniel* for the exact *Time*, when the Propheſy of

(*u*) Sir *Iſaac Newton*; p. 15 and 25.

(*x*) Εἷς τῶν μεγίστων προφητῶν. *Chandler's* Vind. p. 71. And he declares, that he lived 240 years before *Judas Maccabæus*; i. e. the times of *Antiochus*. Antiq. XII. c. xi. See *Sykes'* Eſſay; edit. 2. part 29.

(*y*) *Joſ.* Ant. XII. c. vii. § 6.

a King

a King who ſhould reign over all ſhould *commence*; rather than in any other of the Prophets.

Accordingly, we are told by *Daniel*; after he had explained to *Nebuchadnezzer* the Viſion of the Four great Monarchies, which were to follow one another ſucceſſively—that, in the days of theſe Kings; *i. e.* before the end of the fourth Kingdom, or Monarchy of the *Romans*; (as *Joſephus* himſelf underſtood it) the God of Heaven would ſet-up a Kingdom, which ſhould never be deſtroyed. The words are theſe:—"And in the days of theſe Kings ſhall the God of Heaven ſet-up a Kingdom, which ſhall never be deſtroyed: and the Kingdom ſhall not be left to other people, but it ſhall break in pieces and conſume all theſe Kingdoms; and it ſhall ſtand for ever(z)." And if this Deſcription of the eternal Kingdom to be erected, be compared with his Propheſy of *Meſſiah* the Prince, in the ninth Chapter, Verſe 26; who was to be cut off at the End of threeſcore and two weeks; we ſhall find the time determined to an exactneſs by *Daniel*: which had not been done by any of the other Prophets.

Here we ſee not only the original Propheſy of a King who ſhould reign over all, upon which the old and Conſtant Opinion which prevailed over all the Eaſt was founded; [agreeably to the

(z) *Dan.* xi. 44. vii. 13, 14.

promiſe made to *Abraham*, and the Covenant with *David*] but the Reaſon alſo why the *Jews* expected him [κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν· *eo ipſo tempore*] at that particular time; which expectation, according to *Joſephus*, was the occaſion of the war with the *Romans*(*a*): and, beſides this, we ſee the very principle of the miſtake both of *Joſephus*, and all others, who attributed the Kingdom, that was to be over all, to *Veſpaſian*.

The Prophet had ſaid; "the People of the Prince that ſhall come, ſhall deſtroy the City and the Sanctuary:" *Dan.* ix. 26. and theſe People were certainly the *Roman* Soldiers under *Veſpaſian*; and conſequently, *Veſpaſian* was the *Prince* that ſhould come: and upon this *Joſephus* moſt probably built, when he ventured to foretell to him, that he ſhould be Emperor: and ſo far his Interpretation appears to be juſt; *viz.* that *Veſpaſian* ſhould be the Prince of the *Roman* People: But he was very much miſtaken; when he imagined, that the Prince of the People who ſhould deſtroy the City, was the Prince who

(*a*) The Text quoted by the Biſhop of *Lichfield* and *Coventry*, *Numb.* xxiv. 7. gives no Reaſon, why the *Jews* expected the *Meſſiah* at that particular time. The Biſhop ſeems to fall into a like miſtake with Mr. *Collins*; and quotes a Text, which only proves that the Meſſiah was *expected*; when he ought to have proved, that he was expected at that *particular time*; which occaſioned the War with the *Romans*.

ſhould

ſhould *reign over all:* though he was not ſingular in that Interpretation; for We are told, that *R. Jochanan Ben Zacchai* alſo, flying out of *Jeruſalem* at the ſame time, ſaluted *Veſpaſian* Emperor; ſaying, He ſhould rule the World, or become Prince over all; who ſhould deſtroy that City(*b*). They plainly ſaw in thoſe Propheſies, there was a Prince foretold, who ſhould *deſtroy the City and Sanctuary*; and a Prince, *who ſhould be cut-off*; and a Prince, who *ſhould reign over all:* and the date of the Propheſy, *when* his Kingdom ſhould begin, was now out; and they ſuppoſed, no other Prince had appeared to accompliſh the Propheſy, but *Veſpaſian:* and therefore there is no wonder ſome of them ſhould chooſe, rather than allow their Propheſies to be falſe, to conſider *Veſpaſian* both as the Prince who ſhould *deſtroy the City*, and the Prince who ſhould *reign over all.* And this they thought themſelves forced to, as the only means to ſave the Credit of their Prophets; notwithſtanding the *Chacams*, or wiſe Men, had till that time conſidered the Propheſy to be οἰκεῖον, particularly relating to their own Nation; whereas *Veſpaſian's* riſe to the Empire had no more relation to *Judæa*, than to any other Province. And it appeared, in the Event; that the Prince who was to reign over all, was not the Prince *who ſhould deſtroy the City*; but the Prince *who was to be cut-off.*

(*b*) *Menaſ.* de term. Vitæ; ſect. iii.

But

But though it was very natural for them, in ſuch Circumſtances, to be forced into this Interpretation; becauſe no more than *one* Prince was ſuppoſed to have appeared: and alſo becauſe it was more likely to be true in fact, that he who ſhould *deſtroy the City* ſhould be the *conquering* Prince that ſhould reign over all; than He that ſhould *be cut-off*: yet we find, the wiſe Men were greatly diſappointed with it; and the whole Propheſy was hereby rendered more obſcure than ever: So that *Joſephus* had reaſon to call it an *ambiguous* Propheſy; ſuppoſing it to be accompliſhed in a Senſe, which did not appear to be a natural one; or at all ſatisfactory. For however He might venture to flatter *Veſpaſian* in this reſpect; it is certain, from many other of our Propheſies relating to the ſame Perſon; that the Prince who ſhould reign over all, was to be of a very different Character. He was to be juſt, and having Salvation(*c*). He was to be the Lord, our Righteouſneſs(*d*). He was to be One Shepherd over us(*e*); and *David* was to be our Prince for ever. Our Noble-One was to be of Ourſelves; and our Governor to proceed from the midſt of us(*f*). And conſequently

(*c*) *Zech.* ix. 9.

(*d*) *Jer.* xxiii. 6. xxxiii. 16.

(*e*) *Ezek.* xxiv. 23. xxxvii. 24. 25.

(*f*) *Jerem.* xxx. 21. This Text ſhould be tranſlated in the *ſingular* Number: their *Noble One* ſhall be of themſelves; and

quently an Interpretation, which ſuppoſed all theſe characters to centre in *Veſpaſian*, could never ſatisfy any perſon; who was verſed in the prophetic Writings, and acknowledged this Propheſy to be ἀσαφὲς as we ſee in fact it did not; but was looked-upon to be ambiguous.

But in truth the *Meſſiah*'s Kingdom was a Subject, which neither *Philo* nor *Joſephus* choſe to ſpeak freely upon; whatever they might think of it themſelves(*g*): and perhaps it would have been

and their Governor ſhall proceed from the midſt of them; and I will cauſe Him to draw near, and He ſhall approach unto me. And this Text is underſtood of the *Meſſiah* in the *Targum*, and parelleled with *Dan.* vii. 13. "They brought Him [the Son of Man] near before him." See *Midr. Tillim* on *Pſ.* xxi. 7. and others, in *Pearſon* on the Creed; art. vii. p. 293.

(*g*) *Joſephus*, in Book XII. of his Antiq. when this Subject falls directly in his way, purpoſely avoids it. "*Daniel*, ſays he, added his interpretation of the *Stone*; [which is agreed by our Rabbins to ſignify the *Meſſiah*'s Kingdom] but I do not think fit to relate that: my Buſineſs being only to give a Hiſtory of things *paſt* and *over*, and not of things to *come*." *Joſ. Ant.* X. XI. Bp. *Chandler*; p. 104.

Philo, who lived before *Joſephus*, ſpeaks of the *Meſſiah*'s Kingdom with the ſame Caution; *de Præm. & Pœn.* p. 93, 94. For he firſt touches upon the Propheſy in *Numb.* xxiv. 7. "*He* [*Jacob*] ſhall pour the Water out of his Buckets, and his Seed ſhall be in many Waters, and his King ſhall be higher than *Agag*, and his Kingdom ſhall be exalted:" [where the Perſon ſpoken-of is underſtood to be

been highly imprudent in them to declare to their Conquerors, that a King over the whole World ſtill continued to be expected to ariſe from *our* Nation. They ſeem to have acted much more wiſely, by leaving the matter in obſcurity to the *Heathens*; and at the ſame time explaining to the *Jews* the Propheſies which had been already fulfilled. For they could very well underſtand, what *Philo* obſerves; that a Completion of a *Part* of what was promiſed, was a good reaſon for our believing the *Reſt*. This was a rational foundation of their Faith; and ſuch as God had vouchſafed to them from the beginning.

But had *Joſephus* been ever ſo well ſatisfied, that the Perſon here ſpoken-of, as *the Prince*

be the *Meſſiah*, by the three *Jewiſh Paraphraſts*; and ſince them by *Maimonides*:] and then expreſſeth himſelf thus—"For, as the Oracle ſaith; a Man ſhall go forth, and warring againſt great and populous Nations, ſhall overcome them; God ſending ſuitable help to the Godly.—This Man ſhall extend his Conqueſts for the good of the Conquered; ſo as to be the Strength of the Empire, and the Head of all Mankind: Κράτος Ἀρχῆς Κεφαλὴ ἀνθρωπίνου γένους· p. 927. [of the human race.] Here he refers to the *Meſſiah* in ſuch a manner; as to encourage the Faith of the *Jew*, and the Hopes he builds on the Propheſies; and yet at the ſame time is very obſcure and unintelligible to the Heathens." *Whitby*, on I *Pet.* v. 13. and what *Joſephus* calls the Sacred Writings, *Philo* here calls more obſcurely the Oracle: for he lived in a time more dangerous to Prophetic Writings. See Biſhop *Chandler*'s Defence of Chriſtianity; p. 26.

who

who ſhould reign over all, was *not Veſpaſian*, but *Meſſiah the Prince*; as had long been underſtood by our People: yet was the Propheſy as ambiguous upon that Suppoſition, as upon any other. Firſt, becauſe they did not allow that any ſuch Prince had appeared: and Secondly, becauſe this very propheſy declared, that *Meſſiah* ſhould be cut-off. And that the ſame perſon ſhould be *cut-off*, and yet *reign for ever*; and after *pouring out his Soul to death*, ſhould *ſee his ſeed*, and *prolong his days*; ſeemed to be ſo impoſſible, according to the common ſenſe of the words; as to give room for the Notion of ſome ambiguous meaning, which they could not then comprehend. They were under the very ſame difficulty, as is mentioned by St. *John*: "*We have heard*, ſay they, *out of the* Law; *that* Chriſt *abideth for ever: and how ſayeſt thou, the Son of Man muſt be lifted-up? Who is this Son of Man*(*b*)?" And if they had not had the firmeſt dependence upon the divine inſpiration of the Prophets; they muſt have looked upon the propheſy not as doubtful or ambiguous, but abſolutely contradictory and impoſſible. And it is here that the *Chriſtians* come-in to our Relief; and undertake to explain to us the accompliſhment of thoſe very propheſies, by a detail of plain Hiſtorical Facts; which the wiſeſt of our *Chacams* in the

(*b*) *John* xii. 34.

days of *Joſephus*, and ever ſince, have looked upon to be ambiguous and incomprehenſible.

Whether the *Chriſtians* have ſucceeded better than *We*, in the explanation of this Propheſy; is the Queſtion between us. But as the very attempt proves, that they are carrying-on the ſame important Speculations with Ourſelves; and argue from the ſame propheſies, which we allow to be authentic; and frequently ſpeak of us with great Reſpect(*i*); I can ſee no reaſon, why we ſhould refuſe them the hearing; unleſs we can prove them to be in an Error, by arguing againſt them *à priori*; as I own, till of late, I have always uſed to do myſelf.

It hath been already ſhewn, in my ſecond Letter; that *Meſſiah* the Prince, the ſame who is here propheſied-of, that he ſhould be cut-off before the deſtruction of the City and Sanc-

(*i*) Nos qui arctiore Vinculo [quam Pagani] illis [ſcil. *Judæis*] ſociamur, amemus inter nos; & hoc habeamus commune, quod juſſa audimus ejuſdem Numinis. *Cunæus* de Repub. *Heb.* p. 116.—Divus quidem *Paulus* pro illis caput ſuum devovere cupit; adeo impenſe amat gentem, &c.—ad hæc ſera tempora quod attinet, ſane ſi bene rationem putamus, haud exiguum eſt, quod illi genti noſtra debet Religio, &c. Et profecto D. *Paulus* veneratur eos, & laudibus magnifice effert [*ſic*] errantes. *Quorum eſt Adoptio et Gloria*, &c.—Quæ poterat eſſe major Nobilitas? Tot Patriarchas, Vateſque & Reges in avis proaviſque numerant; denique tot excelſos & divina Virtute Viros, quorum ſunt nomina Cælo conſecrata. p. 114, &c.

tuary;

tuary; is declared by the Prophet *Malachi*, and proved by abundant Teſtimonies of the Old Teſtament, to be the *Angel* of the *Covenant*: and that the New Teſtament agrees in the ſame Doctrine. And as this Belief will clear the Subject from many difficulties; which I uſed to look upon not only as unanſwerable Objections to *Chriſtianity*, but inſtances of direct and wicked Blaſphemy; and argued againſt it under that Notion, as a Religion in its very Nature contradictory to the honour of God and his Attributes; it will be proper in the firſt place, in order to clear the way for my Friend, as I did for my Self; to anſwer the Objections which I then made, and thought to be unſurmountable.

1. And, in the firſt place, nothing ever appeared to me more improbable; than that the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, who for ſo many ages had miniſtred to the will of the Supreme *Jehovah*; coming in his Name, and exerciſing his Authority in the Government of the World; ſhould on a ſudden give place to an *other* Perſon, whom neither We nor our Fathers had known; and be ſuperſeded in his Office and Miniſtry, we know not why; in direct oppoſition to his own promiſe given to *Jacob*, that He would not leave him; till he had performed all that he had ſaid unto him(*k*): and to all the

(*k*) *Gen.* xxviii. 15.

Prophets; who have ſo frequently declared, that his Government ſhould be *eternal* over us.

I argued farther; that the Perſon, who firſt exerciſed this Office and Miniſtry, and who was particularly declared to be our King and Saviour; the ſame *Jehovah*, who took us by the hand to lead us out of *Egypt*; had promiſed that he would come again, and dwell among us, and ſave us in the latter days(*l*). But in what Character can He poſſibly appear; if the *Chriſtian Meſſiah* hath ſucceeded to his Character, Office, and Miniſtry, in every reſpect? As being called the Saviour of the World, *Emmanuel*, or God with us, the expreſs Image of the inviſible *Jehovah*, and ὁ ἐρχόμενος, he that cometh in the name of the Lord; in which Character and Title it is that *Chriſt* expects to be received at his *ſecond* appearance; as he declares himſelf: "Ye ſhall not ſee me henceforth; till ye ſhall ſay, Bleſſed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord(*m*):" Which words are explained by the *Chriſtians*, to mean; that he will come *Dei mandato, poteſtate, virtute, vice, velut Dei legatus, gerens Perſonam Dei*(*n*); than which there cannot be a more perfect Character given of the *Jehovah Angel*. So that, if he be not the *ſame* perſon, the *Chriſtian* Doctrine is incredible; for there cannot poſſibly

(*l*) *Zech.* ii. 10, 11. *Hoſ.* i. 7. *Zech.* x. 12. *Mic.* iv. 7. (*m*) *Matt.* xxiii. 39. (*n*) *Poli* Synop.

be

be *two* ſuch Perſons. Our Scriptures every where declare; there is but *One* Lord, and his Name *One*(*o*); and there can be no *Second* Lord, or Saviour, or *Emmanuel*. Theſe reaſons I ſtill look upon as unanſwerable. But, if *Chriſt* be the *Jehovah-Angel*, all is plain and eaſy before us. He ſtill maintains his Dignity, and Authority, and Office; and his Promiſes may be ſtill completed.

2. Secondly, what was always looked-upon as a great ſtumbling-block to our Nation, and appeared to us to invalidate the evidence of all the Miracles which the *Chriſtians* alleged in ſupport of their Notions; was the abolition of the *Moſaïc* Laws: thoſe Laws, which we received from *Jehovah*; when he deſcended on *Mount Zion*, in the moſt ſolemn and aſtoniſhing manner; accompanied with Thunder, and Lightning, and Earthquakes; and all the appearance of a Revelation from the Supreme God. But, if *Chriſt* be the *Jehovah* himſelf, who appeared and gave the Law; this Objection alſo ceaſes. For, in the firſt place, our own Prophets have declared; that in proceſs of time, a new Covenant would be made with us; by the ſame *Jehovah*, who gave us the Laws of *Moſes*. "Behold, the days come, ſaith *Jehovah*; that I will make a new Covenant with the houſe of *Iſrael*; I will put my

(*o*) *Zech.* xiv. 9. *Pſ.* lxxxiii. 18.

Law

Law in their inward Parts, and write it in their hearts; ſaith *Jehovah*—and I will forgive their Iniquity, and will remember their Sin no more." And again; "I will make an everlaſting Covenant with them; that I will not turn away from them to do them good, but I will put my fear in their Hearts(*p*);" &c. And therefore we can neither expect, nor allow of, any alteration in our Laws; by any other Perſon. And accordingly *R. Albo*, whom we call the divine Philoſopher; proves, in his book of Articles; that the Law may be changed by *God*, as he pleaſes; ſo as may be beſt fitted to the Condition and Circumſtances of Mankind: which he illuſtrates by the Compariſon of a Phyſician; who alters his Preſcriptions, according to the State of the Patient(*q*). I ob-

(*p*) *Jer.* xxxi. 31, 33, 34.—xxxii. 40.

(*q*) Tract. III. cap. xiii. xiv.

R. Albo, [quoted by *Vorſtius*, in his Notes upon *Maimonides* de Fund. Legis; p. 121.] ſays; "Poteſt fieri, ut in eam [Legem] cadat mutatio reſpectu accipientis." —And again; "Scriptura non niſi nos admonet, ne addamus aut ſubtrahamus aliquid Præceptis; pro noſtro libitu vel arbitrio: Sed quid prohibet, quo minus Ipſe Benedictus addat aut demat; prout Sapientia ejus ſtatuit?" &c. And he ſupplies us with an Anſwer to *Deut.* xxiii. 14. and other Texts which ſpeak of the Law's being Everlaſting; in lib. III. cap. 16. ſhewing; that the Phraſes *æternum, uſque in æternum, aut in æternum, Statutum æternum*, &c. are not deſigned to expreſs and teach the Eternity of the Law, but a certain and determinate

I obſerve therefore, ſecondly; that this new Covenant could not poſſibly be made in ſo proper a Time; as when the Laws of *Moſes* ſhould become impracticable: and this was the Caſe, when our Nation and Sanctuary were to be deſtroyed; and We were to be diſperſed through all the World; and ſhould not be any longer able to perform the Sacrifices, which God had commanded to be performed *at the Temple only*(r): nor come up thither from all parts, three times a year, at the great Feaſts; as commanded(s). And much leſs could theſe Laws be obſerved; when the *Meſſiah* was to become a Light to the *Gentiles*, and the Salvation of God unto the End of all the Earth; and all Nations ſhould worſhip him. This would have been impoſſible: and accordingly we are told by *Iſaiah*, in direct Contradiction to the *Moſaïc* Law; "that the Prieſts and the Levites ſhould be made from among the *Gentiles*(t): and this was to be, when all Fleſh was to come and worſhip before *Jehovah*(u)." And *Malachi* ſays; "From the riſing of the Sun, even to the going down of the ſame, my Name

minate Time; *Tempus circumſcriptum, vel determinatum*; which he proves from *Prov.* xxii. 25. *Jer.* ii. 20. *Mal.* iii. 4. *Pſ.* lxi. 5. *Iſ.* xlv. 17. *Eccleſ.* i. 10. *Ex.* xxi. 4. I *Sam.* i. 28. *Numb.* viii. 24. *Iſ.* xxxii. 14. *Pſ.* lxviii. 10. *Iſ.* lxiii. 60, &c.

(r) *Deut.* xii. 14. (s) *Deut.* xvi. 16. (t) *Iſ.* lxvi. 21. (u) *Ibid.* verſe 23.

ſhall

ſhall be great among the *Gentiles*; and in every place Incenſe ſhall be offered unto my Name, and a pure Offering: for my Name ſhall be great among the *Heathen*(*x*)." And we are told by *Iſaiah*; "In that day there ſhall be an Altar to *Jehovah* in the midſt of the Land of *Egypt*, and a pillar at the border thereof to *Jehovah*;" and here the *Egyptians*, and *Aſſyrians*, and *Iſraelites*, ſhall all worſhip *Jehovah*; whom *Jehovah* of Hoſts ſhall bleſs, ſaying, Bleſſed be *Egypt*, my People; and *Aſſyria*, the Work of my hand; and *Iſrael*, mine Inheritance(*y*)." Thus, as the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah* was to be extended, the Laws of his Kingdom were alſo to be extended; as the Nature of the thing required: that all his Subjects might worſhip him in the ſame manner. And therefore, *thirdly*; If it be aſked, by what Power and Authority ſo great a change in the Law could be made; for that no Being in the Univerſe could have Authority to abrogate or change thoſe Laws, which *Jehovah* himſelf had given us; the Prophet *Daniel* will give a plain and direct anſwer. For ſpeaking of *Meſſiah* the *Prince*, he tells us? "*He* ſhall confirm the Covenant with many, *for* [or *in*] one Week; and in the midſt of the Week, *He* ſhall cauſe

(*x*) Incenſe, in the Revelation of St. *John*, is ſaid to be the Prayers of the Saints; chap. v. *Mal.* i. 2.

(*y*) *Iſaiah* xix. 19, 21, 25.

the

the Sacrifice and Oblation to ceaſe(z)."—It was therefore *Meſſiah* the *Prince*, that was to abrogate our Laws; that is, the ſame *Jehovah*, who made the firſt Covenant with our Fathers: in the day that he took them by the hand to bring them out of the Land of *Egypt* (*a*): and conſequently, the *Moſaic* Law was to be aboliſhed by the *ſame* Perſon, by whom it was promulged: and no Man can deny, that the *ſame* Power and Authority that makes a Law, hath a right to change or abrogate it. And accordingly St. *Chryſoſtom* teaches; that "Chriſt *therefore* gave the Law, that he might have Authority, when it was convenient, to put an end to it(*b*)." But,

3. What appeared to me a very ſhocking part of the *Chriſtian* Syſtem, and what I could not avoid looking upon as a great affront and blaſphemy againſt God, was this; that they not only aſſerted, that the Laws of God were to be abrogated; but that it was to be done by *his*

(z) *Dan.* ix. 27. or, as Sir *Iſaac Newton* tranſlates it; in half a week he ſhall cauſe the Sacrifice and Oblation to ceaſe: That is, by the War of the *Romans* upon the *Jews*: which war, after ſome Commotions, began in the thirteenth year of *Nero*, A. D. 67, in the Spring; when *Veſpaſian* with an Army invaded them: and ended in the ſecond year of *Veſpaſian*, A. D. 70; in Autumn, *Sept.* 7; when *Titus* took the City; having burned the Temple twenty-ſeven days before: So that it laſted three years and an half. Sir *Iſaac Newton* on the Prophecies; p. 136.

(*a*) *Jer.* xxxi. 32.

(*b*) *Teniſon* of Idolatry, p. 332.

Command: and boaſted of miraculous gifts, by which *he* gave Evidence to their pretenſions, that they received their Power from *him* to that Purpoſe, and acted by *his* Authority: making the Power of God, as it then appeared to me, ſubſervient to the deſtruction of his own Laws. This ſeemed to be ſo apparent an Abſurdity; as ruined the Evidence from Miracles, which was brought to ſupport it; and returned in diſcredit upon the Miracles themſelves. For, though we could not deny the Facts, and indeed we did not offer at it; yet we could not admit any Miracles, let them be ever ſo extraordinary, as an Evidence againſt God himſelf: and therefore there is no wonder that our Fathers attributed ſuch effects to Magic Art, which was then believed; *i. e.* to the worſt of Cauſes, and of Authors: rather than receive them as the act of *God*, in contradiction to *his own* Laws.

Thus we ourſelves have often reaſoned together, in former days, upon this Subject; and always looked-upon the Argument to be deciſive. Nay, we conſidered our Oppoſition to ſuch Evidence to be highly meritorious; as being commanded in the Book of the Law: which I have frequently quoted, both to *Jews* and *Chriſtians*. "If there ariſe among you a Prophet, or a Dreamer of Dreams; and giveth thee

a ſign

a ſign or a wonder, and the ſign or the wonder come to paſs, whereof he ſpake unto Thee; ſaying, Let us go after other Gods, (which thou haſt not known,) and let us ſerve them; thou ſhalt not hearken unto the Words of that Prophet, or that Dreamer of Dreams: for the Lord your God *proveth* you, to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your ſoul:—and that Prophet or Dreamer of Dreams ſhall be put to death(*d*)."

But when I afterwards conſidered, that the bringing-in of a *new* Covenant was foretold by the Prophets; and therefore the Abolition of the *Moſaic* Law *might be* ſo far from an Oppoſition to God, as to be an actual Accompliſhment of his Promiſe; and that Miracles were abſolutely neceſſary to give a Sanction to the *new* Covenant, whenever it ſhould be introduced; (for no Authority could alter the Laws of God, but *his own*; which could only be known by Miracles, or Prophecy; or both together:) And when I farther conſidered; that the Perſon, by whom they were ſaid to be changed, was declared, both in the Old and New Teſtament, to be the Viſible *Jehovah*, by whom they were promulged; I muſt own, that all my Objections *à priori* ſubſided: together with all that heat and reſentment, which I had from my youth indulged and cheriſhed againſt the *Chriſtian* Principles. For, if *Chriſt*

(*d*) *Deut.* xiii. 1, 2, 3, 5.

be the Viſible *Jehovah*, he had an undoubted Right to abrogate whatever Laws he pleaſed; and to eſtabliſh new ones in their ſtead: nor could there be any queſtion made, but that under the Character of the *Meſſiah*, he would carry on his Miniſtry, in the *latter* ages of the World, in the ſame powerful manner in which he had acted in former times; when he led our Fathers in the Wilderneſs. For, no reaſon can be given why he ſhould be obliged to reſtrain himſelf *now*, more than *formerly*, from acting according to his own natural powers; and from performing ſuch things as we look upon to be miraculous; *i. e.* ſuch as are beyond the powers of Man: and much leſs reaſon can we have to ſuppoſe any ſuch reſtraint; when we conſider, that it was one main part of his Deſign to prove himſelf the Son of God by the Exerciſe of a power Superior to that of Man.

It appears then, from this one Principle; [*viz.* that *Jeſus Chriſt* was the *Angel* of the *Covenant*;] that the *Chriſtian* Syſtem is entirely freed from Four Capital Objections *à priori*, which have prevented *our* people almoſt univerſally from examining into the Proof of it.

1. That *Jeſus Chriſt* is not a *ſecond* ſupreme God, which is objected to the *Chriſtians* in my Firſt Letter; but the Son of the *One* ſupreme God, who miniſtred to the Will of the *One* ſupreme God, in the Creation and Government of

of the World from the beginning, in the Character of *Jehovah*, the *Angel* of the *Covenant*; and conſequently, has a Right to the ſame Worſhip; as was paid to the Angel *Jehovah*, in the Old Teſtament; or, to a greater Worſhip; if he be now more highly exalted(*e*).

2. That he is not ſuperſeded in his Office and Miniſtry, by any other Perſon; as we ſuppoſed him to be in the *Chriſtian* Syſtem: and conſequently, has it ſtill in his power to accompliſh his Promiſes, by bleſſing all the families of the Earth; in the Character of *Meſſiah* the *Prince*, the Saviour of Mankind.

3. That the Abolition of the Ceremonial part of the *Moſaïc* Law, which was foretold by the Prophets; [*viz.* that a New Covenant ſhould be made with the houſes of *Iſrael* and *Judah* by *Jehovah*, who led them out of *Egypt*, not according to the Covenant which he made with our Fathers;] was brought about by the Perſon who had a Right to alter or aboliſh it as he pleaſed; becauſe he was the ſame Perſon that promulged it.

4. That the Miracles of *Chriſt* might *poſſibly* be performed, not in oppoſition to the Laws of God, as we imagined them to be; but in compliance with his deſign of introducing a new and everlaſting Covenant, according to his promiſe:

(*e*) See Letter III, p. 383, 384.

and

and might be neceſſary to prove, that the change in our Laws was not made without the ſame divine Authority by which they were enacted; and, conſequently, might be performed by the power of God; and not by Magic Art(*f*).

And, theſe Objections *à priori* being removed it becomes a very ſerious Subject, and worthy of the ſtricteſt Examination of all ſuch as believe *our* Prophets; Whether the Advent of the *Meſſiah* (according to the Prophecies, and the Expectation of our Fathers founded upon the Interpretation of them) be already paſſed, or not. Or, in other words, whether *Jeſus Chriſt* be *Meſſiah* the *Prince*. And this Queſtion muſt be reſolved, by comparing the prophecies of the *Meſſiah* in the *Old* Teſtament with the Hiſtory of *Jeſus Chriſt* recorded in the *New*: and, if we find a perfect Correſpondence between them, it ſeems to me inexcuſable not to admit his Claim.

For, if we deny, that a perfect Agreement with the Prophecies will prove their Completion; there will be no Criterion left us to judge by, whether the Prophecies ever are fulfilled or

(*f*) *Maimonides* himſelf confeſſes in c. x. *Sanhedrim*, that *Meſſiah* would perform Miracles; in theſe words: "Et ſervient illi omnes terræ, propter Juſtitiam ejus magnam & mirabilia aut Miracula quæ fient per ejus manum"—Contra vero aſſerit, capite penultimo in Tract. *Melachim*, "*Meſſiah* non opus habiturum miraculis, aut nulla edicturum." Unde Inconſtantiæ merito culpari debet." &c. *Vorſtii* Not. in *Abrav.* de Cap. Fid. p. 69.

no:

no: If they can be fulfilled in more than *One* Perſon, they may be fulfilled in a *Thouſand*; and yet not one of that thouſand be the perſon meaned: and the Argument muſt then go in favour of the *Chriſtians*, thus far at leaſt; that the Prophecies of the *Meſſiah may* already be fulfilled, and *Chriſt may* be the *Meſſiah*, and *may* have come long ago; for any thing we know to the contrary.

But the *Chriſtians* will carry the argument much farther. For the Prophecies we are to conſider, are, ſome of them, ſo *determinate* in their *fixed* Dates; as to be incapable of any Completion, after thoſe Dates are out: and conſequently muſt happen within a given period; or not at all. If not at all; the Prophecy muſt be *falſe*. But, if the Prophecy be true, and the Period paſſed; the Prophecy muſt be already *fulfilled*. And if the Prophecy hath been fulfilled in *one* Perſon only, He muſt be *the* Perſon intended. And, conſequently; if *Chriſt* be the only Perſon, in whom the Prophecies have been fulfilled; (as I ſhall go-on to ſhew;) he muſt be the *Meſſiah*.

But, before I begin this Examination, I would obſerve—

I. That We muſt not object to the *Chriſtians* ſuch Arguments, as will contradict or render uſeleſs *our own* Prophecies; and attempt to prove that the *Meſſiah* is not come, by ſuch reaſons as

will

will equally prove that he never *can* come; or that it never can be known, whether he *is* come or not.

II. And, more generally; We muſt not object to the Authority of the *Chriſtian* Scriptures ſuch Arguments as will equally affect the Authority of *our own*. No man can *demonſtrate* the Books of *Moſes* to have been written before *William* the Conqueror's Reign (*g*): but he may ſhew

(*g*) To expect *Demonſtration*, in Matters of *Faith*; is abſurd: from the very Nature of Faith, and of the Matters to be believed. For, firſt; the Effect of *Demonſtration* is not *Faith*, but *Knowledge*: and ſecondly; Nothing is capable of *Demonſtration*, but what ariſes from the Nature of Things; and could not poſſibly have been otherwiſe. Whatever depends on the Will of God entirely, can only be ſhewn to be *credible*; and things *credible* have degrees of *Credibility*, according to the degrees of *Evidence*. And, when the *Evidence* preponderates greatly on one ſide of the Queſtion; the Man, who believes or acts contrary to it, is as inſane, in reſpect of his Underſtanding; as if he ſhould believe or act contrary to *Demonſtration*. No Man can *demonſtrate* to another; that any thing exiſts, which he ſees or hears: And a Sceptic may think it a ſign of Wiſdom and ſuperior Underſtanding in him to *believe* nothing.—But with regard to Revelation, *Demonſtration* is unneceſſary and impoſſible: the Aſſent to it is not *Knowledge*, but *Faith*; and conſequently, it is ſufficient to all the Intents and Purpoſes deſigned by it, if it can be made *credible* to an honeſt Man. And thoſe, who withſtand ſufficient Evidence, muſt take the Conſequence of it; and, in many points of Truth, which are very deſirable as well as important, muſt remain in the dark. And this ſeems to be the

ſhew it to be highly *probable*, that they were written above 3000 years ago. We ought therefore to be ſatisfied with the ſame kind of Arguments, in proof of the *Chriſtian* Scriptures; which we give, in proof of *our own*. I ſhall not at preſent enter into the Examination of either; but only obſerve, that, whatever Proofs we may have, that the Books of the *Old Teſtament* were written at the Times aſſigned to them, and by the Perſons whoſe Names they bear; the Authority for the *Chriſtian* Scriptures is as ſtrong in every reſpect; and in the following Conſiderations much ſtronger. As,

1. The Actions and Characters of the Perſons mentioned in the *New Teſtament*; and the Hiſtory, Chronology, Opinions, Practiſes, and Cuſtoms of the Times, in the ſeveral different parts of the World; are generally confirmed by paſſages of ancient and approved Authors, both *Jews* and *Heathens*; who were contemporary with *Chriſt*, or lived near that time(*b*). And,

2. The Goſpels were written by Three of the Evangeliſts, within about thirty years after the Death of *Chriſt*; which was as ſoon as it

the Caſe of ſome Deiſts. They will not aſſent to the moſt *probable* ſide of the Queſtion; becauſe it cannot be proved to be *certain*: nor *believe*, becauſe they cannot *know*. As if a Man ſhould refuſe to provide for the *Morrow*; becauſe he cannot prove, the World will laſt over the *Night*.

(*b*) See Dr. *Lardner*'s Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory.

could be wanted to ſupply the Perſonal preſence of the Apoſtles; and before the memory of things could wear-out in *Judæa:* and, about 62 years after his Death, the whole Canon of the *Chriſtian* Scriptures was finiſhed. And theſe Books have been quoted, as Sacred and of divine Original, by a ſeries of *Chriſtian* Writers from that time to the preſent age; and the Writings of theſe Witneſſes, authoriſed by the Quotations of ſucceeding ages. So that the Evidence of every age is the ſupport of that which went before it, to the very time of *Chriſt*'s Birth; and thereby the Evidence of the whole rendered impregnable to it's Enemies. In this kind of Proof the *Old Teſtament* is defective, for many ages; and depends ſo importantly upon the Truth of the *New Teſtament*, at this time of day; that, if the *New Teſtament* be not authentic, the Propheſies of the *Old* will in a great meaſure loſe their Credit.

Theſe are the Rules, which I found it neceſſary to lay down for myſelf; when I firſt conſidered this important Subject: for I always looked-upon it to be unworthy of an honeſt Man to defend his Opinions upon any Principle, that was not ſatisfactory to his own mind.

And, under theſe Reſtrictions, I divided my Inquiry into the following heads:

I. What was to be the *Family* and *Lineage* of the *Meſſiah*.

II. The

II. The *Place* of his *Birth*.
III. The *Time* of his *Advent*.
IV. His *Actions*.

But, before I enter upon theſe Heads, it will be neceſſary to conſider an Objection; which is made, by Mr. *Collins*, to the whole Proceſs: to wit, that no *Meſſiah* was ever foretold by the Prophets, *plainly* and *literally*; but only *typically*, *allegorically*, and *ænigmatically*: and that no ſuch Perſon was expected by the *Jews*, till about the time of *Chriſt*: and then, only as a *temporal* Prince.

" I do allow, ſays Mr. *Collins*; that there was, in and about the times of *Jeſus*, a very great Expectation among the *Jews*, of a Perſon to come; who was to redeem them by *Arms* out of the ſtate of miſery and ſlavery, under which they then groaned; and to ſet-up the *Jewiſh* Worſhip, in all its Forms and Splendor, together with the Empire: to which Perſon they gave, *by way of Emphaſis*, the name of *Meſſiah*, or *Chriſt*: the former of which was *Hebrew*, and the latter *Greek*, for any *anointed* Perſon; whether *King*, *Prieſt*, or *Prophet*; as appears by the application and uſe of thoſe Terms, in the *Hebrew* Bible, and Septuagint Tranſlation. This Expectation appears, from the opinion of the Virgin *Mary*; that the Child with which ſhe was big ſhould help

Iſrael: and moſt clearly from the Propheſy of *Zacharias*; who declares of that Child, that he was the Perſon ſpoken-of by the Prophets; who ſhould ſave *Iſrael* from their Enemies, and from the hand of all that hated them. It appears alſo to be pretty prevalent at that time, from the ſeveral Rebellions and Inſurrections, that were ſet on foot by the *Jews*; under the conduct of ſome Impoſtor or other, who pretended to redeem *Iſrael:* and from their attempt to make an Inſurrection under *Jeſus*; who retired from among them, and declined any ſuch Enterprize(*i*)."

Now, ſuppoſing it were *true*, that the *Jews* expected only a *Temporal* Prince; it will make nothing againſt *Chriſtianity:* as long as ſo many Propheſies remain in the Scriptures; which prove that an *Anointed One*, or *Meſſiah*, is there ſpoken-of more *emphatically*; who was to come in a much higher Character. For the queſtion with regard to the *Chriſtians*, is not, what the *Jews*, or even the Apoſtles and Diſciples of *Chriſt thought*, before the matter was explained to them; but, what the *Scripture itſelf contains*. And the careleſſneſs of the *Jews*, in not examining and comparing the Scripture, in order to find out the Truth; can never be a reaſon to conclude, that it may not be inveſtigated by others; who will take more pains in that

(*i*) Scheme of Literal Propheſy conſidered; p. 12.

ſtudy,

ſtudy, and have more light: and it does not ſignify to an honeſt Man, *in what manner* the promiſe of the *Meſſiah* has been there revealed; whether literally or figuratively: provided there be ſufficient Evidence, that it has been revealed *at all*(*k*).

It is true, as Mr. *Collins* obſerves; that in or about the time of *Jeſus*, there was a great and general Expectation of a Perſon to come, who ſhould redeem *Iſrael*; to whom they gave the name of *Chriſt*, by way of *Emphaſis*: And it was expected, by many; that he ſhould redeem them by *Arms*. But the Character, in which this *Emphatical Meſſias* is deſcribed in the *Jewiſh Scripture*, and in which he was expected to come, was that of a *Spiritual* Prince; as

(*k*) God Almighty has, in every kind of Science, in a very extraordinary manner left *Obſcurity in the midſt* of things; [which ſeems to be the true Tranſlation of *Eccleſ.* iii. 11.] in order to diſtinguiſh *Honeſty*, and reward it. So that there is nothing ſo abſurd, no not Atheiſm itſelf; but what may be defended in a ſpecious manner by Men, who are more deſirous of Admiration than of Truth; and lead men to deceive themſelves and others, to their Ruin: while thoſe who follow Truth, unbiaſſed by their Paſſions and Intereſts, will be in no ſuch danger. Such is the reward of an *honeſt Man*; that even his giving way to Evidence (which one would imagine could hardly be avoided by a reaſonable Being) will be rewarded hereafter, as a moral Virtue. So ready is Almighty God to diſpenſe Happineſs, as our moral Governor; whenever he beholds the leaſt appearance of a virtuous mind.

very

very plainly appears, by the Anſwer which was given by *Chriſt* to the Diſciples of St. *John*; when they were ſent to enquire, whether it was *He* that ſhould come; or whether they looked for an *Other*: which is the very Queſtion we are now conſidering. To whom *Chriſt* gave this Anſwer, referring to the Prophecy of *Iſaiah* xxxv. 4, 5. "Go and ſhew *John* thoſe things which ye do ſee and hear; the Blind receive their ſight, the Lame walk, the Lepers are cleanſed, the Dead are raiſed, and the Poor have the Goſpel preached unto them." Here it is manifeſt, that ſome *great* Perſon was expected; and let any man judge by this deſcription, whether it was a *Temporal* or a *Spiritual* Prince: and whether it will agree with the Character and Hiſtory of *Veſpaſian*, or any one except the *Jehovah Angel*, or *Chriſt*; who was to ſave his People, both by his Inſtruction and his Power.

It would be to no purpoſe here to quote the ſeveral Texts of Scripture, in which the word *Meſſiah* is uſed; in order to prove, that he was foretold by the Prophets; long before the *Chriſtian* Æra: becauſe, as Mr. *Collins* obſerves; the word *Meſſiah* is uſed to ſignify *any* anointed Perſon: however he has weakened that Objection, by allowing that one Perſon was called ſo more *emphatically*. And the only way left to examine the Queſtion will be, by con-

conſidering *who* this Perſon is in the *Old Teſtament*, ſo much Superior to all others; as to be called *emphatically* by that name. And to this purpoſe we may at a venture fix upon any of thoſe Texts, wherein ſuch a Perſon is foretold; and then examine, whether they *do* not all of them centre in one and the ſame Perſon; and whether they *can* poſſibly be underſtood of any other. I ſhall conſider two or three, to explain what I mean; which are connected with one another.

And 1ſt, we may pitch upon the cxth *Pſalm*: "*Jehovah* ſaid unto my *Lord*; (or, as it is in the *Chaldee*, *Jehovah* ſaid unto his *Word*;) Sit thou on my right-hand, until I make thine Enemies thy Foot-ſtool." Now of this *Lord* it is declared; "*Jehovah* hath ſworn, and will not repent; thou art a *Prieſt* for *ever*, after the Order of *Melchiſedek*." Here we find one Perſon foretold, the *Lord* of *David*; who was to be a *Prieſt*, and conſequently a *Meſſiah*, of ſuperior excellence to all that went before him; being marked-out and characteriſed by the enjoyment of an *everlaſting* Prieſthood.

Here we ſee, how Mr. *Collins* has hurt his own Cauſe; by his Criticiſm upon the word *Meſſiah*: for the *Chriſtian*, by giving up all proof of a *ſpiritual Meſſiah*, from the mere *Uſe* of that word and arguing from the *literal Senſe* and *Meaning* of it, will avail himſelf of numberleſs

berleſs Texts againſt Mr. *Collins*; which might otherwiſe have eſcaped Notice. But this is not the only good office he has done the *Chriſtian* Cauſe: as I ſhall preſently ſhew.

2. *Daniel*, in the ixth Chapter, foretells the coming of an extraordinary Perſon, whom he calls the moſt *Holy*; who was to be *anointed*, and conſequently a *Meſſiah*; and this *Meſſiah* was to confirm the Covenant for one Week, and to cauſe the Sacrifice and Oblation to ceaſe; and, conſequently, was no *common* Prieſt; but of a much higher Character: and *Daniel* calls him *Meſſiah* the *Prince*. But he muſt have been a *Prieſt*, or a *Prophet*, as well as a *Prince*; or elſe he could not have had the power of confirming the Covenant. Now *Who* ever maintained theſe two Characters in the *Jewiſh* State, except *Chriſt* himſelf? who was both a *Prophet*, and a *King*, and a *Prieſt* for *ever* after the order of *Melchiſedek*.

3. *Iſaiah* propheſies of an extraordinary Perſon, [ch. liii.] whom he calls the *Elect* of God, in whom his Soul delighteth; and that he ſhould make his Soul an offering for Sin, and bear [*i. e.* take away] the Sins of many. Now this was the part of a *Prieſt*; and ſo was his *Interceſſion for Tranſgreſſors*; and, conſequently, He alſo was a *Meſſiah*; agreeably to Mr. *Collins*'s Obſervation; and he muſt be the ſame *Meſſiah* with the laſt mentioned: for,

whereas

whereas the high Prieſt went yearly into the Holy of Holies, to make Oblation for the Sins of the People; this *Meſſiah*, by juſtifying them and bearing their Iniquities, put an end to that part of the *Jewiſh* worſhip: and, this yearly Oblation being no longer neceſſary, (this Prieſt having offered himſelf ἐφάπαξ, once for all;) the Reaſon of Sacrifice and Oblation, which was cauſed to ceaſe by the *Meſſiah* foretold by *Daniel*, ceaſed of Courſe(*l*). But this *Meſſiah*, ſpoken-of by *Iſaiah*, notwithſtanding he was to make his Soul an *offering* for Sin, and to be *cut-off*, as was alſo the *Meſſiah* ſpoken-of by *Daniel*; yet he was to *ſee his Seed*, and be ſatisfied, and *prolong* his days, and divide the Spoil with the Strong; becauſe he *poured out his Soul unto Death*. But how is it poſſible that this, or any one of theſe Propheſies, ſhould be accompliſhed; in any other Perſon than *Chriſt?*

I readily allow; that, if One of them had been completed by *One* anointed Perſon or *Meſſiah*, and an Other of them completed by *an Other:* there would have been great difficulty in concluding, that any one particular Perſon was *emphatically* ſpoken-of as *the Meſſiah*. But, when ſuch extraordinary Propheſies as theſe are all completed in *One*, and could not have been completed in *any other*; the Caſe is ſo plain, that one particular *Meſſiah* is pointed out; καὶ ἰδοχὴν· that the *Chaldee* Paraphraſts have

(*l*) *Heb.* x. 1, 2. Compare with vii. 24, 25, 26, 27.

made no ſcruple to call him continually by that name; as the proper characteriſtic of that great Perſon, whom they expected to redeem *Iſrael*; and ſometimes call the *Word* of *God*.

And though, one would imagine, Mr. *Collins* would be the laſt Man in the World to except to this appellation in the Paraphraſes, upon account of his own Criticiſm upon the word *Meſſias*; yet he could not help thinking it ſo ſtrong an Objection to his own Syſtem, that it was neceſſary ſo material an Evidence againſt him ſhould be taken-off; and could find no better way of doing it, than objecting to the Authenticity of the Paraphraſes. And to this purpoſe he ſays; "It ſeems to me moſt probable, that many of the places of the *Chaldee* Paraphraſts, where the *Meſſiah* is expreſsly named, are Interpolations." And the Reaſon he gives for ſuch an extraordinary Opinion is founded upon this Miſtake; "that thoſe *Jews*, who were in the *Vulgar Error*, or the belief of a *Meſſiah to riſe out of that Nation*; built their Expectation but on *one* ambiguous Oracle or Propheſy found in their ſacred Books. And for this he quotes *Joſephus*(*m*).

I have given the original *Greek* in the beginning of this Letter, together with the Tranſlation; from whence the attentive cautious Reader may obſerve, that *Joſephus* is not giving

(*m*) Ed. *Hudſon*; 1183. *L'Eſtrange*; 971.

the

the Reaſons, upon which the *Jews* built their Expectations that the *Meſſias was to ariſe out of their Nation*; as Mr. *Collins* has miſrepreſented the matter: but he is giving the Reaſon, why the Jews did *at that Time go to war with the* Romans: "That, ſays he, which chiefly excited them to War, was an ambiguous Propheſy; that, *about that Time*, ſome one from their Country ſhould rule the World."

Now there might be a thouſand Texts, which ſpake of the *Meſſiah's ariſing out of our Nation*; and yet but one, that ſo exactly determined the *very Time*; as to be the *occaſion of that War*.

But, ſuppoſing that *Joſephus* had believed the hopes of the *Jews* to have been founded upon this one Propheſy, with regard to the *Meſſiah*'s ariſing out of our Nation; why muſt the old Paraphraſts be lugged-in by mere violence, and contrary to their own words; as partaking of the ſame Error? Eſpecially, as we have manifeſt proof from the Texts themſelves, compared with their Interpretations; that they have made no ſuch Blunder.

I ſhall now go-on to conſider the ſeveral heads propoſed: and examine the queſtion carefully; whether *Jeſus Chriſt* was the *Meſſiah* promiſed to our Fathers. And,

1. Whether he anſwered to the Character of the *Meſſiah*, in his Race or Lineage.—And it

will not be neceſſary to carry up this Inquiry any higher than *Abraham:* for the firſt intimation of the Seed of the Woman mentioned in the threat to the Serpent, which the ancient *Hebrews* underſtood to relate to the *Meſſiah*(*m*), was *general*; and regarded no *particular* Family. [Perhaps Almighty God had not ſo ſoon determined, from what Family the promiſed Seed ſhould ſpring(*n*).] In the promiſe to *Abraham*, it became appropriated to that one Family; and afterwards to the *Iſraelites*. "God made choice of *Abraham* firſt; a man of ſuch godlike qualities, that he was therefore called the *Friend* of God. To that excellent Man God gave the Promiſe; that there ſhould be

(*m*) *Gen.* iii. 15. de remedio a *Meſſia* parando utrumque *Targum* accipit. Agnoſcunt hoc multi inſignes Hebræi (veteres, reliquis longe ſinceriores in interpretatione Scripturarum;) imprimis *Cabaliſtæ*; qui aſſerunt Serpentem hunc eſſe *Satanam*, & Angelum Mortis. Ita R. *Judah*, R. *Samuel*, R. *Bechai*, & R. *Moſes Egyptius*. *Poli* Synopſ.

(*n*) St. *Paul* ſays, the *Seed* here mentioned means a particular Perſon; that is, *Chriſt*.—And ſo the *Jewiſh* Doctors underſtand it, in the *Jeruſalem Targum*; where the fulfilling this Promiſe is expreſsly referred to the days of King *Meſſias*. The word *Seed* is uſed either for a Multitude; as *Gen.* xv. 5. So ſhall thy *Seed* be: or for one Particular Perſon; as *Gen.* xxi. 13. I will make him [*Iſhmael*] a Nation; becauſe he is thy *Seed*.—iv. 25. God hath ſent me another *Seed*, [or Son] inſtead of *Abel*. See *Gal.* iii. 16. *Ainſworth* ad Loca.

one

one of his Seed, in whom all the Families of the Earth ſhould be bleſſed(*o*). This promiſe was afterwards appropriated to *Iſaac*(*p*); "and in *Iſaac* ſhall thy Seed be called." And from this limitation, *Iſhmael*'s and *Eſau*'s ſons are excluded. And therefore it is ſaid; "Whoſo voweth concerning *Abraham*'s Seed, is free from *Iſhmael*'s and *Eſau*'s Sons; and is not bound, but touching *Iſraelites*(*q*)." And thus the promiſe of the *Meſſiah* became ἰδιάζον, appropriated to *our Nation*.

The Promiſe to *Abraham* we find, *Gen.* xii. 2, 3.—xv. 18.—xvii. 6.—xxii. 18. And in *Eccleſiaſticus* it is ſaid; "Therefore *He* (the *Moſt High*) aſſured him (*Abraham*) by an Oath, that he would bleſs the Nations in his Seed; and that he would multiply him as the duſt of the Earth, and exalt his Seed as the Stars, and cauſe them to inherit from Sea to Sea, and from the River unto the utmoſt part of the Land. With *Iſaac* did he eſtabliſh likewiſe, (for *Abraham* his Father's ſake) the bleſſing of all men, and the Covenant: and made it reſt upon the head of *Jacob*(*r*)." Now the Completion of *two* parts of

(*o*). The ancient *Jews* referred this to the calling of the *Gentiles* by the *Meſſiah*; as we ſee *Sepher Caſidim*; § 961. and to the abode of *Shechinah*, or Λόγος: as it is explained by *Joſeph. de Carnifol Saare Iſidor.* fol. 3. Col. iv. and fol. 4. Col. i. Biſhop *Lloyd.* See *Gal.* iii. 8, 16. and ſo *Peter* ſuppoſes it ſpoken of the *Meſſiah*; *Acts* iii. 25.

(*p*) *Gen.* xxi. 12. (*q*) *Gen.* xxviii. 4. See *Maimonides'* Treatiſe of Vows; ch. ix. ſect. 21. (*r*) *Ecclus* xliv. 21.

of

of this Promiſe; *viz.* the multiplying of the ſeed of *Abraham*, which came to paſs as ſoon as it well could, when it became a Nation of 400,000 men; and the giving the Land of Promiſe, between the River of *Egypt* and the great River *Euphrates*(*s*); which was compleated in the days of *David*; will without doubt be in time ſucceeded by the accompliſhment of the *third*, in which all the Families of the Earth ſhall be bleſſed in his Seed.

After this Promiſe to *Abraham*, we find alſo a particular Promiſe to *David*, by *Nathan* the Prophet; that a King ſhould ariſe from the houſe of *David*, whoſe Kingdom ſhould be eſtabliſhed for ever(*t*). "My Covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my Lips: Once have I ſworn by my Holineſs, that I will not fail *David*. His Seed ſhall endure for ever; and his Throne as the Sun before me. It ſhall be eſtabliſhed as the Moon; and as a faithful Witneſs in Heaven." From theſe Promiſes it was believed by the *Jews*; that the *Meſſiah*, who ſhould reign over all, was appropriated to the houſe of *David*; and accordingly, when *Chriſt* did any mighty works, they immediately applied to him the Title of the Son of *David*; this being the Perſon they expected to eſtabliſh the Everlaſting Kingdom(*u*). And

(*s*) *Gen.* xv. 18. (*t*) *Sam.* vii. 16. *Pſ.* lxxxix. 34. &c. (*u*) *Mat.* ix. 2.—xx. 30, 31.—xii. 23.—xv. 22. See Dr. *Syke*'s Eſſay; p. 15, 16.

therefore

therefore *Hoſea*, about 250 years after this Promiſe, ſpeaking of the latter days, calls their King by the Name of *David*. "Afterwards ſhall the Children of *Iſrael* return, and ſeek *Jehovah* their God, and *David* their King; and ſhall fear *Jehovah* and his Goodneſs in the latter Days(*x*)." He is alſo called ſo by *Jeremiah*(*y*); and by *Ezekiel*(*z*). *Iſaiah* declares, that "the *Meſſiah* ſhall come-out of the Root of *Jeſſe*; and a Branch ſhall grow-out of his Roots(*a*):" and *Jeremiah* ſays; "I will raiſe-up to *David* a Righteous Branch, and a King ſhall reign and proſper, and ſhall execute judgement and juſtice upon the Earth: in his days *Judah* ſhall be ſaved; and *Iſrael* ſhall dwell ſafely: and this is his Name, whereby he ſhall be called; *Jehovah our Righteouſneſs*(*b*): and here *the Meſſiah* is agreed by our own Interpreters to be the Perſon ſpoken-

(*x*) This the *Chaldee* Paraph. *Hoſ.* iii. 5. and many Rabbins explain to ſignify the *Meſſiah*; *eminenter*, as *Grotius* ſays.

(*y*) *Jer.* xxx. 9. And they ſhall ſerve the Lord their God, and *David* their King; whom I will raiſe-up unto them.

(*z*) *Ezek.* xxxiv. 23, 24. And I will ſet up one Shepherd over them, and he ſhall feed them; even my Servant *David* ſhall feed them, and he ſhall be their Shepherd; and I the Lord will be their God, and my Servant David ſhall be a Prince among them—xxxvii. 24. *David* my Servant ſhall be King over them: ver. 25. my Servant *David* ſhall be their Prince for ever.

(*a*) *Iſaiah* xi. 10. (*b*) *Jer.* xxiii. 5, 6.

of

of(*c*); and, agreeable to this account from *our* Prophets, we are told by the Evangeliſt *Luke*(*d*); that *Joſeph* [the Huſband of *Mary*] went up from *Galilee*, out of the City of *Nazareth*, into *Judæa*; unto the City of *David*, which is called *Bethlehem*; [becauſe he was of the Houſe and Lineage of *David*.] It appears then, by the Hiſtory of *Jeſus Chriſt* in the *New* Teſtament; that he was born of the Stock and Lineage of *Abraham*, and *David:* which agrees with the Deſcription of the *Meſſiah* in the Propheſies of the *Old* Teſtament.

II. The *ſecond* Criterion, by which I propoſed to examine this queſtion is, the *Place* of the *Meſſiah*'s birth; and this the Prophet *Micah* foretells to be *Bethlehem*, the City of *David*(*e*). "But thou, *Bethlehem Ephratah*, though thou be little among the Thouſands of *Judah*, yet out of Thee ſhall *He* come forth [or be born(*f*)] unto me, that is to be Ruler in *Iſrael:* whoſe

(*c*) Ita *Chald.* Suſcitabo *Davidi Meſſiam*, qui juſtus eſt. Et *Talmudici* in *Bava Bathra*; cap. v. fol. 75, 76. *Meſſia*, de quo ſcriptum eſt: *Jer.* xxiii. 6. Idemque dicunt *Midras* in *Pſ.* xx. Vid. *Synopſ.* 848. And *Pearſon* on the Creed.

(*d*) *Luke* i. 68—74. alſo verſes 54, 55. *Matt.* i. 1, &c.

(*e*) *Micah* v. 2.

(*f*) יצא ſignifies properly, *to be born*. See the Quotation to prove it, in Biſhop *Chandler*'s Defence, &c. p. 125. *Gen.* x. 1, 14.—xvii. 6.—xiv. 26.—xxxv. 15. *Job* i. 25. *Jud.* ix. 30. I *Chr.* ii. 53.

goings-

goings-forth have been from Everlaſting(*g*)." The *Chaldee* Paraphr. explains this of the *Meſſiah* (*h*); and ſo does the *Talmud*(*i*), and many of the Moderns. He is King *Meſſias*, ſays *Abravanel*; after *R. Solomon Jarchi*, and *R. Dav. Kimchi*; and ſo *Pirke Eliezer*(*k*).

The *Meſſiah* then was to be born in *Bethlehem* of *Judæa*; and this, we are told by the Evan-

(*g*) Theſe words, "whoſe goings-forth have been from Everlaſting;" are explained in the *Targum* to mean, "whoſe name was foretold of Old, from the days of the World:" *i. e.* who was propheſied-of from the Beginning; and accordingly the *Targum* on *Zech.* iv. 7. ſays, the *Meſſiah* ſhall be revealed, whoſe name is ſpoken, or foretold, for ages before; [Biſhop *Chandler*; p. 128.] But I rather imagine the words refer to his going before our Fathers in the Wilderneſs, and in the Sanctuary; as mentioned by the *Pſalmiſt*; lxviii. 7, 24, 25. "O God, when thou wenteſt forth before the people; when thou didſt march through the Wilderneſs, the Earth ſhock, the Heavens alſo dropped at the preſence of God; the God of *Iſrael*." And ſo, verſe 24. "They have ſeen thy goings, O God; even the goings of my God, my King, in the Sanctuary; the Singers went before, the Minſtrells followed after;" &c. Upon which the *Chaldee* Paraphraſe ſays; "The Houſe of *Iſrael* have ſeen the goings of thy Majeſty upon the Sea, O God." So that the goings-out from Everlaſting, relate to the Viſible *Jehovah*'s leading the *Iſraelites* in the days of Old through the *Red Sea*; and going before them in the Wilderneſs, in a Fire by Night, and a Cloud by Day; and tabernacling on the Sanctuary in the Cloud.

(*h*) *Chal.* Paraph. ex te coram me prodibit *Meſſias*.

(*i*) *Talm.* in *Chelek*.

(*k*) *Pirke El.* cap. iii. Vide *Poli* Synopſ. p. 1940.

geliſt, was the City of *Chriſt*'s Birth. For when *Herod* demanded of the Prieſts and Scribes, where *Chriſt* ſhould be born; they ſaid unto him in *Bethlehem* of *Judæa:* and quoted this Text from *Micah*(*l*), to prove it. And when ſome of the *Jews* objected, that *Jeſus* could not be the *Meſſiah*, becauſe he was born in *Galilee*; they argued upon the ſame Principle: "hath not the Scripture ſaid, that *Chriſt* cometh of the Seed of *David*; and out of the Town of *Bethlehem* (*m*)? Hence then is a *Second* capital mark, in which *Jeſus* of *Nazareth* agrees to the Character of the true *Meſſiah*; that he was born in *Bethlehem* of *Judæa*.

III. The *Third* Criterion, by which I ſhall examine this Queſtion, is the *appointed time*, in which the *Meſſiah* was promiſed to appear; which is fixed and determined by *Haggai*, *Malachi*, and *Daniel*, to be *before the Deſtruction of the ſecond* Temple; and by *Jacob* to be *before the Sceptre ſhould depart from Judah, and a Law-giver from between his Feet*.

The words of *Haggai* are theſe: "For thus ſaith the Lord; Yet once, it is a little while, and I will ſhake the Heavens and the Earth, and the Sea, and the dry Land; and the Deſire of all Nations ſhall come, and I will fill this houſe with Glory; ſaith the Lord of Hoſts(*n*)."

(*l*) *Matt.* iii. 5. *Micah* v. 2. (*m*) *John* vii. 41, 42. (*n*) *Hag.* ii. 7, 8, 9.

The

The *Jews*, about the time of *Chriſt*, interpreted this Text of the *Meſſiah:* and *Akibah*, chief *Rabbi* and Counſellor to *Barcochab* in *Trajan*'s reign, underſtands it ſo: as the *Targum* ſeems to do on *Iſaiah* iv. 2. And *Jarchi* confeſſes, that the Ancients expounded it ſo(*o*). *Abenezra* parallels it with *Malachi* iii. 1. meaning the ſame Perſon. *Grotius* ſays, it was underſtood of the *Meſſiah*'s appearance in the ſecond Temple; by all that lived before it's deſtruction(*p*). Nor can the words be otherwiſe underſtood; if we conſider, that the Perſon here ſpoken-of is diſtinguiſhed by the ſame Characters which are uſed of the *Meſſiah* in other parts of the Scripture; as the *Deſire of all Nations*, or the Perſon *in whom all the Nations of the Earth ſhould be bleſſed*; and as the Perſon *who ſhould bring Peace or Forgiveneſs*.

That the *Meſſias* was the Perſon, who in the Scriptures is deſcribed as the *Deſire of all Nations*, will appear from the following Texts; "Behold my Servant whom I uphold, my Elect in whom my Soul delighteth:—He ſhall bring forth Judgment to the *Gentiles*—and *the Iſles ſhall wait for his Law*." *Iſ.* xlii. And again; "there ſhall be a Root of *Jeſſe*, which ſhall ſtand for an Enſign of the People: to it ſhall the *Gentiles* ſeek, and his Reſt ſhall be glorious." *Iſ.* xi. 10. And of the ſame Perſon he declares; "though

(*o*) Biſhop *Chandler*, p. 81. (*p*) Remains of Dr. *Ruſt.*

Iſrael be not gathered, yet ſhall I be glorious in the Eyes of the Lord: and God ſaid, I will give thee for a Light to the *Gentiles*; that thou mayeſt be my ſalvation unto the Ends of the Earth(*q*)." And this Saviour was the ſame whom they waited-for; and the *Jehovah* who was to ſave and redeem them (*r*); and whom the Iſles waited-for. And this gathering of the Nations is the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, which St. *Paul* ſpeaks of, predeſtinated from the beginning; "that in the diſpenſation of the fulneſs of Times God might gather together in One, all things in *Chriſt*; both which are in Heaven, and which are on Earth(*s*)." From theſe and many other Texts it appears; that *Chriſt* is very properly ſpoken-of, as the *Deſire* of all Nations; and the Perſon, who was to rule-over all; the *Gentiles*, as well as the *Jews*(*t*).

It appears no leſs clearly, that he is deſcribed as the Perſon who was to bring Peace or *Forgiveneſs*. That this was one Eſſential Character of the *Meſſiah*, appears from numberleſs Texts. When the new Covenant was promiſed to be made with the Houſe of *Iſrael*; God ſays, "I will forgive their *Iniquity*, and I will remember their Sins no more(*u*)." And ſo it was under-

(*q*) *Iſ.* xlix. 6. *Rom.* xv. 9, 10, 11, 12, &c. *Mat.* xii. 18. (*r*) *Iſ.* xlix. 23, 26. li. 5. lx. 9. (*s*) *Eph.* i. 10. (*t*) See *Iſ.* xlix. 22. and *Deut.* xxxii. 43. (*u*) *Jer.* xxxi. 34. *Heb.* viii. 8.

ſtood

ſtood by the Apoſtle of the *Gentiles*: "There ſhall come out of *Sion* the Deliverer, and ſhall turn-away Ungodlineſs from *Jacob*; for this is my Covenant with them, when I ſhall take-away their Sins(*x*)." Upon this account *Iſaiah* calls the *Meſſiah* the Prince of *Peace* (*y*); and ſays, "How beautiful upon the Mountains are the feet of Him that bringeth good Tidings, (ὡς εὐαγγελιζομένου, LXX; that preaches the Goſpel) that publiſheth *Peace*, that bringeth good Tidings of Good, that publiſheth *Salvation*, that ſaith unto *Zion*, thy God (i. e. the *Jehovah Angel*) reigneth (*z*)!" Here we ſee, that publiſhing *Peace* and *Salvation* is done by the ſame Perſon: and His Covenant was to be a Covenant of *Peace*(*a*). And *Zechariah* ſays; "Shout, O Daughter of *Jeruſalem*; behold, thy King cometh to thee—and he ſhall ſpeak *Peace* unto the *Heathen*(*b*)." And therefore R. *Joſe Galilæus* ſays, the name of *Meſſiah* is called *Peace*; according to that of *Iſaiah*; Father, Eternal, Prince, Peace(*c*). And Mr. *Joſeph Mede*, ſpeaking of the Angels at the Birth of *Chriſt*, declaring *Peace* on Earth, *Goodwill* towards Men; ſays, "This is an *Appoſition*, or *Exegeſis*; the latter words explaining the former. *Peace* on *Earth*, is *Good-will* towards *Men*." And this *Peace* he

(*x*) *Iſ.* lix. 20. *Rom.* xi. 27. (*y*) *Iſ.* ix 6. (*z*) *Iſ.* lii. 7. (*a*) *Iſ.* liv. 10. *Ex.* xxxiv, 25. (*b*) *Zech.* ix. 10. (*c*) On *Micah* v. 2, 5. Bp. *Chandler*, p. 82.

explains

explains to mean *Remiſſion* of *Sins*; and ſays; the *Peace* ſo often foretold of the *Meſſiah*, that he ſhould bring; is accompliſhed in the New Teſtament, under the notion of *Forgiveneſs*(*d*).

And this Propheſy was fulfilled, when he ſat daily in the Temple to give inſtruction (*e*); and to cure all manner of Diſeaſes, by his miraculous power (*f*); and forgive them their Sins, upon their confeſſing him to be the *Meſſiah:* according to his promiſe in the Perſon of the *Jehovah-Angel*, when he ſhould bring-in the *new* Covenant.

This is confirmed by *Malachi:* whoſe words are theſe—"Behold I will ſend my Meſſenger, and he ſhall prepare the way before me; and the Lord whom ye ſeek, ſhall ſuddenly come to his Temple; even the *Meſſenger* [or *Angel*] of the *Covenant*, whom ye delight in; behold, he ſhall come; ſaith the Lord of Hoſts(*g*)."

The ancient *Jews* underſtood this Text, of the *Meſſiah*; and the words are very expreſs. The *Lord* whom ye *ſeek*, the *Lord* of the *Temple*, and the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, are ſo peculiarly expreſſive; as to prove them incapable of being underſtood of any other Perſon: And this agrees with the ancient Traditions: that the ſecond Temple ſhould remain, till the days of the *Meſſiah*. And Mr. *Collins* obſerves; that even *Abra-*

(*d*) Diſcourſe *Luke* ii. 14. (*e*) *Mat.* xxv. 55.
(*f*) *Matt.* xx. 1, 14. (*g*) *Mal.* iii. 1.

vanel,

vanel, *Jarchi*, and *Abeneſra*, explain the ſecond Meſſenger to be the *Shechinah*; which was to return and give Anſwers by *Urim* and *Thummim*. And I ſhall make no ſcruple to join with him in this Interpretation.—This being the ſame Perſon, to whom *Jacob* addreſſed himſelf in Prayer; (*h*) who is ſo often in the Old Teſtament called *Elohim*, and *Jehovah*, and *Jehovah Elohim*; and is looked-upon by all the ancient Fathers to be the *Logos:* and whom all the more ancient *Jews* before them, and the ſtricteſt Followers of their Fathers' Traditions, are wont to expreſs by the words *Shechinah*, and *Mimara*(*i*).

The words of Mr. *Collins* are as follows: "The *ſecond* Meſſenger in *Malachi* is to come to his Temple, as Lord and Proprietor thereof; that is, to preſide there, and give Oracles, and ſet-up the *Jewiſh* Forms of Worſhip; is to come ſuddenly, or immediately; is ſtiled the Meſſenger of the Covenant; that is, the *Jewiſh* Covenant made with *Levi* (*k*); the Covenant made with the Fathers: and is to purify the Sons of *Levi*, that they may duely perform the *Jewiſh* Ceremonies as of old(*l*).

(*h*) *Gen.* xlviii. 16.

(*i*) See Dr. *Allix*'s diſſertation on the Angel who is called the Redeemer, ſect. 2.

(*k*) *Mal.* ii. 4, 5, 8, 10. (*l*) *Ibid.* chap. iii. 3, 4.

Here

Here are ſome intimations; which I ſhall examine in the Notes, and ſhew to be *falſe* (*m*): but

(*m*) Mr. *Collins* explains *Matt.* iii. 3, 4. concerning the Sons of *Levi*, to ſignify that when the Perſon foretold comes, he ſhall purify them; that they may perform the *Jewiſh* Ceremonies, *as of old*. But the Prophet does not mention the *Jewiſh* Ceremonies in this place. His words are, *that they may offer to the Lord an offering in Righteouſneſs: then ſhall the offering of* Judah *and* Jeruſalem *be pleaſant unto the Lord; as in the days of old, and as in former years*. Here therefore Mr. *Collins* has impoſed either upon himſelf, or his Reader. For an offering in Righteouſneſs may as well be performed with *Chriſtian*, as with *Jewiſh* Ceremonies: and beſides, it is not ſaid; that they may *perform their Ceremonies*, as of old; but that their offerings may be *well-pleaſing*, as of old.

I would farther obſerve; that an Offering in Righteouſneſs may be underſtood in a general ſenſe, as a Sacrifice of Thankſgiving; *Pſ.* cxvi. 17. and mean only an Act of Worſhip; as it ſeems only to be uſed, *Mal.* i. 2. "In *every place* Incenſe ſhall be offered in my Name; and a pure Offering." Now, according to the Law of *Moſes*, this could not be; the *Jews* were only to offer at *Jeruſalem*. *Deut.* xii. 13, 14. and ſo the offering of Incenſe is ſpoken-of in the *Apocalypſe* v. 8.—viii. 3.

Mr. *Collins* ſays; "we have God's threatning, that, when this Meſſenger comes, he will exact Obedience to his Ordinances: from which the *Jews* have ſwerved." But this relates to the Sins of the *Jews* againſt the Law of *Moſes*, before this Meſſenger ſhould come; and not at all to his giving them *Jewiſh* Ordinances afterwards.

He goes-on as follows: "God alſo ſays on this Occaſion, that he changes not; and promiſes, that the *Jews* ſhall live in their own Land." [ver. 11, 12.] I anſwer, this

but, as to the main point, it ſeems to be *indiſputable*; for theſe Reaſons. 1ſt, That no other Perſon

this promiſe is conditional; as appears from the Context, from verſe 8 to the 12th: and relates to the times before this Meſſenger ſhould come among them. And the aſſurance that he changes not, has no Relation to his continuing the *Jewiſh* Laws among them, when he ſhould come to his Temple; but to what immediately follows; *therefore the Sons of* Jacob *ſhall not be conſumed:* which he had frequently declared before; *viz.* that, though he made a full end of *other* Nations, he would not make a full end of *them*; but correct them in meaſure. *Jer.* xxx. 11. and elſewhere,

"He afterwards bids them remember and keep the Law of *Moſes*; [ch. iv. 4.] as the way to happineſs and greatneſs, and the way to prevent his judgments." But this alſo relates to the time of their Continuance under the *Moſaic* Law; before this *Angel* of the *Covenant* ſhould come to his Temple: *leſt, when he ſhould come, he ſhould ſmite the Earth with a Curſe.* [ch. iv. 6.] whereby he declares, that he would viſit them in Bleſſings or Curſes; according as they ſhould behave. Compare ch. iii. 10, 11, 12, with iv. 4, 6.

Mr. *Collins* concludes as follows: "All which plainly relates to God, and to the Eſtabliſhment of the *Jewiſh* worſhip; and is wholly inconſiſtent with the Character and Deſigns of *Jeſus*; who came not to the Temple, to dwell there as it's Lord and Proprietor; but came to put an End to the Temple, and to deſtroy the very notion of the neceſſity of ſuch a place, and to ſet-up a new Form of Worſhip, different from the *Jewiſh*: who, according to his true Character, could not be the Delight of the *Jews*; and who came to put an End to all the old Ordinances, and to the Covenant made of old with *Levi* and the Fathers, and to deſtroy *Jewiſh* Prieſthood; and not to reform it, by

Perſon can properly be called the Lord of the Temple: and 2dly, Becauſe the words are expreſs; that the Lord whom they ſought was the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, whom they delight in.

rendering it conformable to the primitive Plan of *Moſes*." p. 121.—To which I anſwer:

1. The Prophet does not ſay; that he ſhould dwell and preſide in his Temple, as it's Lord and Proprietor; but only that he ſhould *come* to his Temple. *Mal.* iii. 1.

2. The ſetting-up a new Form of Worſhip, &c. was entirely agreeable to the Promiſe made to our Fathers by the *Jehovah-Angel*; as we find in the Text ſo often quoted. *Jer.* xxxi. 31, 32. in which it appears, that the *Jewiſh* Prieſthood was *not* to be *reformed*; but a *new* Covenant to be made, *not* according to the Covenant made with our Fathers. The Character and Deſigns of the *Jehovah-Angel* were therefore the ſame.

3. The Perſon ſought, and in whom they delighted, was the ſame Perſon who would ſmite the Earth with a Curſe; if they did not repent: [iv. 6.] and of whom it is ſaid, Who may abide the Day of his coming? [iii. 2.] And this is entirely agreeable to the Character of the *Jehovah-Angel*, in whom they delighted; as he is deſcribed *Ex.* xxxiv. 7. as keeping mercy for thouſands, and yet viſiting the Iniquity of the Fathers, unto the third and fourth Generation.

If *Chriſt* was not this very Perſon; it does not appear to me, that the Temple was *His* Temple; nor that *He* was the Lord whom they ſought, and in whom they delighted; [for they knew nothing of his Character or Hiſtory, as having never interpoſed in their affairs:] but, if *Chriſt* be the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, the Perſon here manifeſtly ſpoken-of; the whole Propheſy is clear and intelligible.

1. No

1. No other Perſon can properly be called the *Lord* of the *Temple*, who was capable of coming to his Temple; but the *Angel* of the *Covenant*. The *Jews* had no more reaſon to imagine the inviſible *Jehovah* was here mean'd, who dwelleth not in Temples made with hands; or that this expreſſion had a figurative meaning, of *God's taking them into his Favour*; than they had to interpret the ſame words figuratively in the Books of *Moſes:* in which God is ſaid to *meet with them*, and *commune with them* from the Mercy-ſeat; *Ex.* xxv. 22. which was literally performed by the *Jehovah-Angel*; the Ark being built for his Reſidence; to which the Temple afterwards ſucceeded; when the Nation came to be ſettled, and in opulent Circumſtances; in the Reign of *Solomon*.

2. But, if this is not ſufficient to determine the real Perſon here ſpoken-of; the Prophet himſelf has done it, in as expreſs words as can poſſibly be uſed; by declaring the *Lord* of the *Temple*, the *Lord* whom they ſought, to be the Meſſenger of the *Covenant*, in whom they delighted; *i. e.* the *Shechinah*, or *Word* of *God*. This Propheſy corroborates what was foretold by *Haggai*; and determines the Time of the *Meſſiah*'s Advent to be while the ſecond Temple was ſtanding.

The Propheſies of the *Meſſiah*'s Advent are confirmed by the ancient Propheſy of *Jacob*.

"The Sceptre ſhall not depart from *Judah*, and a Law-giver from between his Feet; till *Shiloh* come: and to him ſhall the gathering of the People be(*n*)."

The word *Shiloh*, ſays an Anonymous Writer, [Mr. *Mann*] is a modern Reading; unknown in any other part of the Scripture, or any of the old Commentators: coined by the *Jewiſh* Correcters of the Bible into שלה a word of no ſignification: whereas the LXX read שלו; that is, אשר לו; he to whom it is; he, to whom *It*, viz. the *Sceptre* belongs; ᾧ ἀπόκειται· he, for whom it is reſerved, as it is in the original beſt Edition of the LXX Verſion; as *Juſtin Martyr* long ago affirmed (*o*): and as it now ſtands in the *Alexandrine* MS(*p*). And what confirms this reading is the Text of *Ezek.* xxi. 27. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it [the Diadem or Crown,] and it ſhall be no more, untill he come, whoſe right it is, ᾧ καθήκει LXX. and I will give it him. And, if this be the true meaning, it plainly refers to the King of the *Jews*; for whom the Sceptre was reſerved, and to whom the People were to be gathered. Mr. *Ainſworth* explains it the Proſperer, or Safe-maker; others, the Peace-maker; from שלה: all which agree to the ſame Perſon. Another very ingenious Interpre-

(*n*) *Gen.* xlix. 10.
(*o*) Dial. cum. *Tryph.* p. 348. Edit. *Thirl.*
(*p*) Crit. Notes on ſome Paſſages of Scripture.

tation

tation is given us by the learned and judicious Dr. *Hunt*, Profeſſor of *Arabic* at *Oxford*. He underſtands the true etymology of the word *Shiloh* to remain in the *Arabic* שלו, SHALA, *Liberavit, ſubduxit ab anguſtia & exitio*. According to which etymology, *Shiloh* will be *The Deliverer from Diſtreſs and Deſtruction*; a Title, which juſtly belongs to *Jeſus Chriſt*; the Lord of Life, and Saviour of the World. And, if it ſhould be objected to it, that the *Jod* is wanting, between the *Schin* and the *Lamed*; he obſerves, that, in the *Samaritan* Copy the word is written without the *Jod*: as it is likewiſe in one of the moſt ancient *Hebrew* MSS, which Dr. *Kennicot* has conſulted on this Text.

I ſhall not here examine the ſhifts uſed by the Moderns, to avoid the force of this Text; ſome pretending, that the Sceptre departed from *Judah* before *Chriſt*, by its falling into the hands of Foreigners; which is ſufficiently anſwered by *Cunæus* (*q*); who ſhews, that the Text only regards the Continuance of the *Jewiſh* State: and that *Judæa*, as ſeparated from *Iſrael*, ſhould remain a Kingdom, till the coming of the *Meſſiah*. On the other hand; *Abravanel* and Others ſuppoſe, the Sceptre is not yet departed from *Iſrael*; and *Menaſſeh Ben Iſrael*, that it is ſtill in the hands of the Tribe of *Judah*(*r*).

(*q*) *Cunæus* de Repub. *Heb.* l. I. c. ix.
(*r*) Ibid. p. 401.

When

When I ſee my Brethren forced into ſuch Contradictions, I cannot help thinking it much ſafer to truſt the Interpretations of the Ancients, who were unbiaſſed; than the Modern gloſſes of men, who ſeem ſo deeply prejudiced. And it is certain, the Ancients underſtood this Text of the *Meſſiah*(*s*). The *Chaldee* Paraphraſt ſays; "He that hath Dominion ſhall not be taken-away from *Judah*, nor a Scribe from his Children's Children; until the time that *Chriſt* come, whoſe the Dominion is; and Him ſhall the Peoples [or Nations] obey." And the *Jeruſalem Targum* ſays; "Kings ſhall not ceaſe from the houſe of *Judah*, nor Doctors that teach the Law from his Children's Children; until the time that *Chriſt* do come, whoſe Kingdom *is*; and all the Kings of the Earth ſhall be ſubject unto Him." So that both the *Targums* confine the ſenſe to this; that the Peoples, [*i. e.* both *Jews* and *Gentiles*] ſhould gather unto and obey *Chriſt*; or in other words, that the Perſon here ſpoken-of ſhould be the Prince that ſhould reign over all; προσδοκία ἐθνῶν, as the LXX ſay in this place: and that this ſhould happen, before *Judah* ſhould ceaſe to be a Kingdom(*t*).

(*s*) Remains of Dr. *Ruſt*; p. 56. which refer to the *Targum* of *Onkelos*, and *Jonathan*, and *Jeruſalem*; *Ber. Rabbati*, the *Cabaliſts*, and *Talmud* Doctors. See alſo *Ainſworth* ad locum.

(*t*) See *Joſ. Mede*'s VIIIth Diſcourſe. He reads; the Sceptre ſhall not depart from *Judah* untill *Shiloh* come, and

[untill]

The laſt Proof I ſhall refer-to, as particularly convincing with regard to the *Meſſiah*'s Advent, before the Deſtruction of the Temple; is from the Prophecy of *Daniel*. In the ſecond Chapter of *Daniel* he deſcribes the Viſion of *Nebuchadnezzar*; in which he beheld a great Image, whoſe Head was of fine Gold, and his Arms of Silver, his Belly and Thighs of Braſs, his Legs of Iron, his Feet part of Iron and part of Clay(*u*). He beheld alſo a Stone, cut out without Hands; which ſmote the Image upon his Feet that were of Iron and Clay, and brake them to pieces; and afterwards became a great Mountain(*x*).

The Prophet explains this Image to ſignify four ſucceſſive Monarchies; and mentions the *Babylonians*, then in Being, as the firſt. This was ſucceeded by the *Medo-Perſians*, *Greeks*, and *Romans*. And the Stone cut-out without hands he explains to mean the Kingdom which God would ſet-up, before the End of the laſt Monarchy. The words are theſe: "And in the days

[untill] the gathering of the People be to him. Both which things did not happen till the deſtruction of the city by *Titus*. But the Goſpel was firſt preached in all the World for a Witneſs to all Nations, according to *Mat.* xxiv. 14. "When the *Gentiles*, ſays Mr. *Mede*, by the preaching of "the Goſpel, ſhould be gathered to *Chriſt*; then ſhall the *Jewiſh* Church and Common-wealth be utterly diſſolved;" a new one being firſt erected among the *Gentiles*.

(*u*) *Dan.* ii. 32, 33. (*x*) ver. 35.

of

of theſe Kings or Kingdoms, ſhall the God of Heaven ſet-up a Kingdom which ſhall never be deſtroyed; and the Kingdom ſhall not be left to other People, but it ſhall break in pieces and conſume all theſe Kingdoms; and it ſhall ſtand for ever: foraſmuch as thou ſaweſt that the Stone was cut out of the Mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the Iron, the Braſs, the Clay, the Silver, and the Gold(*y*)." And the ſame Propheſy is repeated in the ſeventh Chapter; where the four *Monarchies* are repreſented to *Daniel* under the appearance of four *Beaſts*: after which the Prophet ſays; I ſaw in the Night Viſions, and behold one like the Son of Man came with the Clouds of Heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days; and they brought him near before him: and there was given to him Dominion, and Glory, and a Kingdom," &c(*z*).

Now all our great Rabbins agree with the *Chriſtians*, in the Interpretation of theſe Texts. "Aſk them what is mean'd by the Stone; and they anſwer, as one Man, the *Meſſiah*. Go-on to the Image, that the Stone ſmote on the Toes; and they are as unanimous in ſaying, it is the *Roman* Empire. Demand farther, of the Mountain; and ſtill they agree, that it relates to the Kingdom of their *Meſſiah*: that ſhall extend it-

(*y*) ver. 44. (*z*) *Dan.* vii. 13, 14.

ſelf

ſelf far and near, ſubdue all other Nations, and be itſelf Everlaſting(*a*)."

From all which it appears; that the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah* was to begin, during the reign of the *Romans*; or *fourth* Kingdom propheſied-of by *Daniel*; agreeably to the univerſal Expectation, which prevailed over the whole Eaſt; as we have ſhewn upon the Authority of *Tacitus*, *Suetonius*, and *Joſephus*.

But the moſt determinate Propheſy of the *Meſſiah* is in the ninth Chapter of the ſame Propheſy.

Dan. ix. Ver. 24. "Seventy Weeks are cut-out upon thy People, and upon thy holy City; to finiſh Tranſgreſſion, and to make an end of Sins; to expiate Iniquity, and to bring-in everlaſting Righteouſneſs; to conſummate the Viſion and the Prophet, and to anoint the moſt Holy."

"25. Know alſo and underſtand; that, from the going-forth of the Commandment to cauſe to return and to rebuild *Jeruſalem*, unto the Anointed the Prince, ſhall be ſeven Weeks(*b*)."

(*a*) Biſhop *Chandler*; p. 100. See his Quotations.

(*b*) This twenty-fifth verſe ſeems to relate to the *ſecond* coming of *Meſſiah*, as a *Prince*, and the future rebuilding of *Jeruſalem*; upon *our* Reſtoration and Reëſtabliſhment in our Country, ſeven weeks before his *ſecond* coming.

The Tranſlation of theſe verſes is from Sir *Iſaac Newton*; as well as the Interpretation of them.

"26. Yet threeſcore and two Weeks ſhall *it* [viz. *Jeruſalem*] return, and the Street be built, and the Wall; but in troublous times(*c*): And after threeſcore and two Weeks, the Anointed ſhall be cut-off; and *it* [i. e. *Jeruſalem*] ſhall not be His; but the People of a Prince to come ſhall deſtroy the City and the Sanctuary, &c."

Now, the date of theſe *ſeventy* Weeks could not begin; till the *Jews* became a Body Politic, or a People and holy City; [ver. 24.] and that was when *Ezra* went-up to *Jeruſalem*, and crëated Magiſtrates, in the 7th year of *Artaxerxes Longim.* 456 years before *Chriſt*, &c. And it muſt end, with the *Meſſiah*'s Death; becauſe [ver. 24.] the End of the Viſion is joined with the Expiation of Sin, and the Conſummation of a Prophet: and therefore, if theſe *ſeventy* Weeks are counted for Weeks of Years, according to the prophetic Language, a Day for a Year: [*Ezek.* iv. 6.] they expire in 490 Years, the very Year in which *Chriſt* died: for the year 456, in which the *Jews* became a Body Politic under *Ezra*, added to the year of *Chriſt* 34, in which he died, makes

(*c*) The building the Street and Wall in *troublous* times, diſtinguiſhes it to relate to the building them under *Nehemiah*; whereas the future Building (*ſeven* weeks before the *ſecond* coming of *Chriſt*) will be, according to the Propheſies, in *proſperous* times. See *Iſ.* xlix. 22, 23, &c.

490 years. Or thus: the year of the *Julian* Per. 4257, in the 7th of *Artaxerxes*, ſubtracted from the 4747, in which *Chriſt* died, gives 490 Years; or 70 Weeks of Years.

The Computation of the 62 weeks, from the building the Street and the Wall, [ver. 26.] is no leſs determinate.—" *Nehemiah* came to *Jeruſalem*, in the 20th year of *Artaxerxes*, while *Ezra* continued there; and found the City lying waſte, and the Houſes and Wall unbuilt(*d*): and finiſhed the Wall, in the 25th day of the month *Elul* (*e*); in the 28th year of the King: *i. e.* in *September*, in the year of the *Jul.* Per. 4278. Count now from this year, threeſcore and two weeks; that is, 434 years; and the reckoning will end in *September*, in the year of the *Jul.* Per. 4712: which is the year, in which *Chriſt* was born; according to *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Irenæus*, &c. and this was the general Opinion, till *Dionyſius Exiguus* invented the vulgar account; in which *Chriſt*'s Birth is placed two years later."

But there is no neceſſity, in order to defend the Faith of the *Chriſtians*, and demonſtrate the Miſtakes of the *Jews*; to enter into ſo exact a Calculation of the ſeventy Weeks, as is here given by Sir *Iſaac Newton:* or even to diſpute whether the Kingdom which the God of Heaven was to ſet-up, was given to the Son

(*d*) *Neh.* ii. 17.—vii. 4. (*e*) *Neh.* vi. 15.

of Man before or after the End of the *Roman* Empire. This is all *ex abundanti*. It is ſufficient merely to quote the undeniable Evidence from this Propheſy, that *Meſſiah* the Prince was to be cut-of *before the Deſtruction of the City and Sanctuary*. In this the Prophet is clear and determinate; and confirms the Propheſies already quoted from *Haggai* and *Malachi*. So that here are four of our own Prophets witneſſing againſt Us, reckoning the Patriarch *Jacob* for one, in behalf of the *Chriſtians*; that the Advent of the *Meſſias* has been long ſince paſt. And conſequently, we muſt either give-up the Veracity of the Prophets; or agree with the *Chriſtians*.

Theſe Calculations plainly ſhew the Principles, upon which our Fathers argued in former days, to have been the ſame upon which the *Chriſtians* argue now. How elſe could they have expected the *Meſſiah*, ſo vehemently about the time of *Veſpaſian*(*f*)? How could *Nehemiah*, one of the Doctors, who lived fifty years before *Chriſt* came, declare openly ſo long before; that the time ſignified by *Daniel* would in fifty years be elapſed(*g*)? And *Jacchiades* compute,

(*f*) *Suetonius* and *Tacitus*, *Anna* the Propheteſs, the Woman of *Samaria*, &c. and all that at *Chriſt*'s appearance expected him, as recorded in the New Teſtament.

(*g*) *Grotius* de Ver. l. V. p. 14. Epiſt. *Claud. Serrav.* p. 52. where *Grotius* tells *Sarravius*, that this is to be found

compute, that the ſeventy weeks of *Daniel* ended in the Deſtruction of the ſecond Temple(*b*); and R. *Raf* declare, that all the appointed times were then ended(*i*)? And R. *Joſe*, who lived at the Deſtruction of the Temple by *Titus*, ſay, Alas, the Time of the *Meſſiah* is over(*k*)? And, beſides theſe private Calculations, it is manifeſt that Our whole Nation computed in the ſame manner, from the great number of falſe *Meſſiahs* which at that time aroſe; and that no one pretended to that Character, till ſixty-nine of *Daniel*'s Weeks, by one Computation or other, were nearly expired(*l*); and after that time the People were ready

found in the *Talmud*, under the Title *Sanhedrim*, as he remembered; and he thought alſo, in *Abenada* upon *Daniel*. See *Patrick*'s Tranſlation of *Grot.* de Verit. Preface.

(*b*) *Jacchiades* ad *Dan.* ix. 14. Vid. *Grot.* de Ver. lib. V. n. 85.

(*i*) *Talmud* under the head *Sanhedrim*. Biſhop *Clayton*; p. 105.

(*k*) *Grotius* quotes R. *Jacob* in *Caphtor*; de Ver. l. V. n. 82.

(*l*) Biſhop *Chandler*; p. 121, 128.

In the *Talmud* ch. *Chelek*, is found that famous ſaying of Rab. *Elias*; which agrees with theſe Calculations, [as to the time of the *Meſſias*' Advent, which was in or about the year of the world 4004:] that there ſhould be 2000 years of *Inanity*, 2000 years under the *Law*, and 2000 under the *Meſſias*; and in *One* the World would be deſtroyed. This *Elias* is held in ſo much honour among the

ready to believe the Propheſy fulfilled by *Judas Gaulonita*, *Herod*, *Barchocab*, or any one that offered to head them. Laſtly, it is worth obſerving; that *Manaſſeh Ben Iſrael* divides the *Jews* of thoſe times, when the City was taken, into two Opinions.

1ſt, Thoſe that believed the City was doomed to *Roman* Vengeance; and ſubmitted to the General, as thinking *He* muſt be that *Prince*; who was to come before our final Deſtruction: and, 2dly, thoſe that thought the *Meſſiah* would come *before the end of the ſeventy weeks*; and computed that their City and Temple could not be deſtroyed, before he came: and therefore expected Salvation to the laſt hour. Both ſides took *Daniel* with them: and we need not a fuller Proof, that they underſtood him in this place to propheſy of the *Meſſiah*;" and explained the *ſeventy* weeks, as the *Chriſtians* do.

It appears then from *Haggai*, *Malachi*, and *Daniel*; that the *Meſſiah* was to come, before the Deſtruction of the ſecond Temple(*m*); and the

the *Jews*; *ut effato ejus enucleando non minus ſtudeant, quam ipſius S. Scripturæ Textui*; that they take as much pains to explain his words, as the Scripture itſelf. Remains of Biſhop *Ruſt*; p. 48.

(*m*) See in Dr. *Prideaux* Connect. Vol. IV. part. ii. book viii. bef. *Herod* 1. ſeveral very remarkable Texts, interpreted by the ancient *Jews* of the *Meſſias*, agreeably to

the Time of *Chriſt*'s Advent anſwers to theſe Propheſies. And, as all theſe Propheſies are determined by numerical Dates, or undiſputed Facts already paſſed; if they are not yet fulfilled in *Chriſt*, or in ſome other Perſon, it is impoſſible they ſhould ever be fulfilled at all.

It is of very little Conſequence, in what ſenſe our Commentators *now-a-days* may explain theſe Texts. Our ancient Rabbins were diſintereſted, and unbiaſſed by *their* prejudice; and underſtood them, as the *Chriſtians* now do(*n*). But our Moderns are under ſubjection to

to the Interpretation of the *Chriſtians*; which are now explained, by the modern *Jews*, in another manner: As *Gen.* iii. 15.—xlix. 10. *Numb.* xxiv. 17. *Iſ.* ix. 6, 7. —xi.—lii.—liii. *Micah* v. 11. *Pſ.* ii.—xlv.—lxxii.

(*n*) It muſt be obſerved; that the Temple in *Herod*'s time was not built from it's ruins, but by little and little made new at ſeveral times: ſo as to be called the *ſame* Temple: and accordingly, the duration of the ſecond Temple includes the whole ſpace from *Zorobabel* to *Veſpaſian*. [*Talmud.* cap. ult. de Synedrio & Titulo *Fama*, & Titulo *Roſch. Haſkana*. *Grotius* de Ver. l. V. not. 89, 90.]

Accordingly we find, in *Herod*'s Oration to the *Jews*, recorded by *Joſephus*; that he only propoſed to ſupply what was wanting in the ſecond Temple, to make it equal to *Solomon*'s, and build it up to the ſame heighth; (becauſe it was ſixty cubits lower) without any regard to it's length or breadth: and this ſeems to have been the whole that is meaned by *Joſephus*, [if his teſtimony in this is to be believed, which is queſtioned by *Eccius* and others]

to human Authority; and care not how much they ſtrain, and diſtort the natural Senſe of Scripture; if they can but evade the force of the *Chriſtian* Arguments. It was not, while the *Meſſiah* was expected to come within the times appointed; nor for ſome time after the *Chriſtian* Æra began, that they ever thought of diſagreeing with the ancient Interpretation; nor till they were diſconcerted by the Arguments which the *Chriſtians* urged from the Propheſies: And then they were obliged to defend their unbelief, by a new and forced interpretation of the Texts. In ſo critical and ſuſpicious a time, were the preſent Gloſſes introduced; and the Authority of the Prophet *Daniel* firſt began to be ſlighted. But neither has this been found ſufficient to ſerve the purpoſe; and therefore, after much ſtruggling in vain againſt the Truth, their Objections have been thoroughly canvaſſed and replied-to: and

others] when he ſays, the Foundations were taken away; meaning that thoſe only were taken away, which were neceſſary to raiſe the building higher: and this is the opinion of the learned *Hoornbeek*; and appears the more probable, becauſe, as *Joſephus* teſtifies, the Temple itſelf which was covered-in, was but a year and a half in building; and 1000 Prieſts employed: and the reſt of the building finiſhed in eight years, by the hands of 11,000 workmen: whereas the Temple of *Solomon* employed 143,000 men, for ſeven Years. See alſo *Prideaux* Connect.

they

they have been obliged to purſue ſuch a deſperate Method to defend themſelves, *Ne quid Religio detrimenti capiat*; as ſhews at once their weakneſs and diſtreſs: by ſetting-up a *dictatorial* Power, which forbids, under the Penalty of a Curſe, that the Subject ſhould be examined into. But more of this by and by.

IV. The *fourth* Criterion; by which I propoſed to examine, whether *Jeſus Chriſt* be the *Meſſiah*; is his Actions: upon which head I ſhall conſider his Miracles, his Death, and his Kingdom.

1. I ſhall conſider his *Miracles*. Theſe were made the Criterion of his Miſſion, by *Chriſt* himſelf; when *John* ſent two of his Diſciples, ſaying; "Art thou he that ſhould come, [ὁ ἐρχόμενος, the *Meſſiah*] or do we look for another(*o*)?" And this was laying the Proof upon plain Fact, which every Man was able to judge-of; and was the Teſt, which all Impoſtors fear. But on this Subject the *Chriſtians* are very ſafe; on the one hand, by the poſitive Proof of the Evangeliſts, and the Letters of the Apoſtles ſtill extant; in which they appeal to their *Miracles*, as to known Truths: and,

(*o*) *Luke* vii. 22. "Then *Jeſus* anſwering, ſaid unto them; Go your way, and tell *John* what things ye have ſeen and heard; how that the blind ſee, the lame walk, the lepers are cleanſed, the deaf hear, the dead are raiſed, to the poor the Goſpel is preached." This Text refers to *Iſ.* xxxv. 4, 5. See I *Cor.* xii. 10. *Heb.* ii. 4.

on the other hand, even their Enemies, *Celſus*, *Porphyry*, and *Julian*(*p*), have not been able to quote any hints or memoirs extant in their Times, which contradict thoſe Accounts; which they certainly would have done, if there had been any ſuch: " for they were all men of fine Parts, and great Reading; the firſt lived about 150, the ſecond about 240, and the laſt 300 years after *Chriſt*. So that their Objections, without Proof, can be of no weight; and their very ſpeaking of them as works of *Magic*, ſeems to allow, that the facts were actually performed; which is in effect to give-up the Objection: for the Queſtion is, not how they *accounted* for them; but whether they were *performed* or not. The notion of doing Miracles by Magic, is now out of date with all Men of Senſe; and reckoned among the *Aniles*

(*p*) *Celſus* apud *Orig.* lib. II. Ἐνομίσαλε αὐτὸν εἶναι υἱὸν Θεοῦ, ἐπεὶ χωλὲς καὶ τυφλὲς ἐθεράπευσε. Ye believed him to be the Son of God; becauſe he cured the Lame and Blind. *Grot.* Annot. ad lib. II. de Verit.

Julian—Imo rem fatetur; cum dicit, verbis recitatis à *Cyrillo*; lib. VI. Εἰ μή τις οἴεται κυλλὲς καὶ τυφλὲς ἰάσασθαι καὶ δαιμονιῶντας ἐφορκίζειν ἐν Βηθσαϊδᾷ καὶ ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ταῖς κώμαις, τῶν μεγίστων ἔργων εἶναι. Unleſs any one ſhould think it to be a mighty work to cure the Lame and Blind, and poſſeſſed with Devils, in the Villages of *Bethſaida* and *Bethany*. *Grot* ib.

Add to theſe Enemies of Chriſtianity, that even the *Talmud* confeſſes the Miracles of *Chriſt*; [as we are informed by *Grotius*,] in Titulo *Aboda Zera*.

Fabulæ:

Fabulæ: and the Story, that *Chriſt*'s Miracles were performed by the Name of God, which he found in the Temple, is of the ſame ſtamp: and the pretence, that we know not how they were performed, has been already anſwered with ſuch force and acuteneſs; that I need only quote the paſſage, *John* ix.

A Man, who was born blind and reſtored to ſight by *Jeſus Chriſt*, was brought before the *Phariſees* for examination. Some ſaid, that *Chriſt* was a Sinner; becauſe he had done this Cure on the Sabbath-day: but Others anſwered; How can a Man, that is a Sinner, do ſuch Miracles? The Man himſelf being aſked, what *he* thought of him; confeſſed, that he believed him to be a Prophet: But he was preſſed with the Argument we are now conſidering. We know, ſaid they, that God ſpake unto *Moſes:* but as to this Fellow, we know not from whence he is. To which he gave this plain ſatisfactory and ſpirited Anſwer —Why, herein is a marvelous thing; that ye know not from whence he is: and yet he hath opened mine Eyes. Now we know, that God heareth not Sinners; but, if a Man be a Worſhipper of God, and doth his Will, *him* he heareth. Since the World began, was it not known; that any one opened the Eyes of one that was born blind. If this Man were not of God, he could do nothing, &c. I am content, that *My* opinion ſhall ſtand or fall by this one Argument.

—If it be aſked, what anſwer the *Phariſees* made: it was the ſame that ever is made on *ſuch* occaſions by *Power*, when baffled by *Reaſon*. They anſwered, and ſaid unto him; Thou waſt altogether born in Sin, and doſt thou teach *Us?* And they caſt him out; or excommunicated him.——A *Chriſtian* Auto de Fé would have burned him.

And here it may not be improper to rectify our falſe reaſoning upon the xiiith of *Deuteronomy:* and lay before you the true Principle We ought to have gone upon, by obſerving; that, though a ſign or a wonder foretold by a Prophet, might be ſuffered to come to paſs; ſaying, Let us ſerve other Gods; and this might be a proper Trial of our Faith; not only becauſe our Reaſon was capable of informing us, that ſuch a Doctrine muſt be falſe; but alſo becauſe the Accompliſhment of a ſingle Propheſy, or Miracle, ought not by any means to be ſet in Compariſon with that ſeries of Wonders by which the Supremacy of the Lord *Jehovah* over them, as their Lord and King, had been ſo often proved; and of which the Evidence ſtill continued, by the appearance of his Angel or *Shechinah*, upon the Mercy-ſeat, to reveal to them his Commands: yet it would entirely overturn the uſe and intent of Miracles, to ſuppoſe, that God will ever ſuffer them to appear as Evidences of a Falſity, without controul, in matters of importance

portance to the Salvation of Men; and in oppoſition to his own Revelation, where the human Underſtanding is unable to judge of the Truth of the Doctrine propoſed: Becauſe this would lay them under an abſolute Incapacity of knowing, whether they were the works of God or no; and of receiving that Revelation which he deſigned to inſtruct them in, and aſſure them of, in his name. In other Caſes I ſee not why the Interpoſition of Providence is more neceſſary to be expected, in order to hinder us from being impoſed upon, either by *real* or *pretended* Miracles; than by any *other* kind of deceit. Had the Miracles of *Chriſt* therefore been perſormed as introductory to ſuch Doctrines, as we knew, or were *capable* of knowing, to be *falſe* or *wicked*; we ſhould have reaſon to reject the Doctrine, and believe the Miracles to proceed from a bad Being: as this was not the caſe, but his Doctrines were pure and perfect, and diſcovered to Mankind the Goſpel, or good News; *viz.* the Completion of what had ſo long been promiſed by the Prophets to our Fathers; we ought to conſider them as the Atteſtations, which God gave to the People of that Age(*q*), of the divine Miſſion

(*q*) *Miracles* were the Atteſtations of God to the Age in which they were performed: but we, who live in a remote Age, have the *more ſure word of Propheſy*: We want not the medium of Miracles, to convince us; but carry our Argument

Miſſion of *Chriſt*; in like manner as he had before atteſted to the Miſſion and Doctrines of *Moſes*.

As to the Credibility of Miracles in general, and the Objections that are brought againſt them by the Deiſts; I ſhall conſider them in my *ſeventh* Letter.

2. A ſecond Conſideration, with regard to the Actions of *Jeſus Chriſt*, is the ſetting-up the Kingdom propheſied-of by *Daniel*, *Micah*, and the reſt of the Prophets.

Now no Perſon, that ever pretended to the *Meſſiahſhip*, except *He* alone, ever erected any Kingdom in *this World*; or ever left any Orders relative to a *future* Kingdom; or ever thought of erecting a *Spiritual* One: whereas *Chriſt* did not only declare himſelf a King; but even to this Hour the *Chriſtians* own him as ſuch, and look upon themſelves as *his* Subjects, and deny that any Potentate hath Authority over them, in oppoſition to *his* Laws. And therefore the Kingdom of *Chriſt*, i. e. the *inviſible* Church of *Chriſt*, is as much a real Kingdom under *him*; as ever the Kingdom of *Iſrael* was a Kingdom under the Viſible *Jehovah*. The King of the *Chriſtians*

ment immediately from the Accompliſhment of *Propheſy*, to the Divinity of the Miſſion. It is at leaſt as difficult, to thoſe who do not ſee them, to prove that Miracles were ever performed; as to prove the Divinity of the Miſſion, without them: *i. e.* it is eaſier to prove the Completion of *Propheſy*, than the Exiſtence of *Miracles*.

hath

hath as viſibly appeared to *Them*, as *Jehovah* King of the *Jews* did to *our* Fathers; and given his Laws to *them*, as the Viſible *Jehovah* did to *Moſes*. And, though it was not ſuch a Kingdom as our People at that time generally expected; yet it was ſuch a one, as ſeveral of *our* beſt Commentators ſince have deſcribed; that is, a Kingdom of a *Spiritual* and *Intellectual* Nature (*r*): and the preſent *Inviſibility* of their King is no more an Argument, that it is not a Kingdom, and that *he* does not govern it; than it is againſt the Dominion of the Viſible *Jehovah* in his Abſence: And this one Conſideration invalidates the Claim of all other Pretenders to the Title

(*r*) Neque nos deſideramus et expectamus diebus *Meſſiæ* amplos reditus & divitias; neque ut vehamur equis, nec ut vinum bibamus inter muſices genera; prout exiſtimant pervertentes vel infatuantes intellectum: Sed Prophetæ & Juſti expetiverunt dies *Meſſiæ*, & vehemens erat deſiderium eorum ad illos; qui tunc congregaturus eſt juſtos & bonum regimen atque juſtus Rex & magna ejus Poſſeſſio, ac diſtributio Sapientiæ ejus atque appropinquatio ejus ad Deum; prout dicitur, Dominus locutus eſt ad me, Filius meus es, hodie genui te. Et paulò ante ait, [*Maimon.*] *Meſſiæ* temporibus futuros divites & pauperes, robuſtos & infirmos: atque hujus notæ plura apud eundem in citato loco legere eſt; quæ plane aliam faciem hujus Imperii nobis depingunt, quam plerique *Judæorum* facere amant. See the Notes of *Vorſtius*, in *Abravanel* de Cap. Fid. p. 68. where he quotes as above from *Maimonides*, ad *Eſai.* xlii. 7.—And ſee *Maimon.* in c. x. *Sanhedr.* And R. *Juda Bitzeel* in *Nitzzach*—"*Meſſias* erit Præſes ac Moderator in Rebus Divinis abſolute."

of

of *Meſſiah*: and appropriates it to *Chriſt* alone. And the rejecting the *Meſſiah* as their King, by declaring they had no King but *Cæſar*; was the great act of Rebellion and Apoſtacy, for which *our* Nation has been ever ſince puniſhed; by a Subjection to all the Kings of the Earth where-ever they have been diſperſed.

But to this it may be objected: that the Kingdom, which I ſpeak-of, does in no proportion anſwer to the *Dominion* and *Glory* of the *Meſſiah*'s Kingdom, as it is deſcribed in many Texts of the Old Teſtament; where it is ſaid to extend through the whole Earth, to deſtroy it's Enemies, and to be carried-on with extraordinary Power and Succeſs, and to laſt for ever.—This is certainly the Truth: and the reaſon of this *ſeeming* Inconſiſtency is this; becauſe thoſe Propheſies; which relate to the *Meſſiah*'s appearance in the Clouds of Heaven, in full regal Power, when he ſhall come to reign *over all*, are not yet fulfilled. And nothing can more effectually expoſe the *Chriſtian* Gauſe, than the forced Interpretation which ſome make uſe of to explain theſe Propheſies; as if they were already accompliſhed. And therefore Mr. *Joſeph Mede*, one of the moſt learned and judicious of all the *Chriſtian* Writers, who plainly ſaw of what ill conſequence ſuch Reaſoning muſt be, ſays; "While we ſtrain thoſe plain and famous Propheſies, which relate to *Chriſt*'s *ſecond* Advent,

to

to the *firſt*; the *Jews* deride us, and are more confirmed in their Infidelity." And in another place he ſays, with regard to this very Propheſy of *Daniel*, and the neceſſity of interpreting it as not yet fulfilled; "They take-away the pillar of Evangelic Faith, in the glorious Advent of *Chriſt*; who, neglecting the ancient Tradition of the Church, would transfer that Propheſy to any other meaning (*s*):" He means, to any ſenſe in which it ſhall be underſtood as already compleated.

3. But though on the one hand it muſt be owned, there are many of the plaineſt and moſt remarkable of the Propheſies ſtill unfulfilled; eſpecially thoſe which relate to the *Meſſiah*'s coming in the Clouds of Heaven to execute his royal Power(*t*); yet, on the other hand, it muſt not be forgotten; that there are alſo many others, which very evidently prove; that he muſt have come into the World *before* that time and paſſed through a ſeries of *Afflictions*, and even *Death* itſelf. And it will be found impoſſible

(*s*) *Mede*'s Works; p. 537. Dum enim nos clariſſimas illas, de rebus in ſecundo *Chriſti* adventu, Prophetias ad primam torquemus, *Judæi* nos deriſui habent; et in infidelitate ſuâ magis obfirmantur.

Ut omnino Fidei Evangelicæ de glorioſo *Chriſti* adventu ſubductum eant; qui, vetuſta Eccleſiæ traditione neglecta, Prophetiam iſtam alio transferre conantur. p. 532.

(*t*) *Dan.* vii. 13.

to account for these things, unless we consider the *Messiah* in two different Stations; the one *afflicted*, and the other *glorified*. And in this solution of the Difficulty *we* are as much concerned, as the *Christians*. I say, it is as necessary for the *Jew* to account for those Prophesies which relate to the times of his Affliction and Death, (when the Stone was first cut-out without Hands (*u*);) as it is for the *Christians* to account for the times of his Prosperity and Triumph: (when it brake in Pieces the Feet of the Image, and became a Mountain.)

And therefore it will be necessary for us both, if we are desirous to know the Truth; to consider that part of the *Messiah*'s History, in which he is represented as *afflicted* and *distressed*; as well as that, in which he appears in Power and great Glory, and coming in the Clouds of Heaven.

Now the Prophets all agree; that the *Messiah* was to be born into this World. *Isaiah* says; "Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the Government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace(*x*)." The *Chaldee* Paraphrast explains this of the *Messiah*. And again: "There shall come forth a Rod out of the Stem of *Jesse*, and a Branch out of his Roots (*y*); which the *Chaldee* explains, *egre-*

(*u*) *Dan.* ii. 34. (*x*) *Isaiah* ix. 6. (*y*) *Ib.* xi. 1. *dietur*

dietur Rex de Filiis Iſhai & Meſſias *de filiis filiorum ejus germinabit:* and univerſally, the *Meſſiah* was believed to be the Seed of *David*; and formed from the womb to gather *Jacob* to *Jehovah*(z). And as to his Death; the Prophet *Daniel* declares, that after threeſcore and two weeks *Meſſiah* ſhould be cut-off: and *Iſaiah* confirms this; telling us, "He poured out his Soul unto Death; he was brought as a Lamb to the Slaughter; he made his Grave with the Wicked, and with the Rich in his Death(*a*)." And the *Targum* is expreſs, that the perſon here ſpoken-of by *Iſaiah* is the *Meſſiah:* For it reads, in the beginning of the Section; "Behold my Servant, the *Meſſiah:*" and there is no variation of Perſons through the whole detail; but the ſame Perſon, who deals prudently, [lii. 13.] is the righteous Servant, who by his Knowledge or Prudence juſtifies many; [liii. 11.] And not only the *Targum*, but the Doctors, with one mouth, aſſert, as they received it by Tradition from their Anceſtors; that the *Meſſiah* muſt be underſtood by God's Servant that ſhall proſper and be axalted(*b*).

Now, though theſe Propheſies of the *Meſſiah*'s Death are as plain as thoſe of his Birth; and there is as great a debaſement in the *Meſſiah*'s con-

(z) *Iſ.* xlix. (*a*) *Iſ.* liii.

(*b*) See Biſhop *Chandler*; p. 160, &c. *Allix* on the *Jewiſh* Church; ch. xxxiii.

deſcending to be *born into* this World, as his *dying out* of it: and indeed, no kind of diſhonour in *either*; if done in obedience to *His* will, whoſe commands are always conſiſtent with infinite Wiſdom: Yet *our* Nation has always been ſo dazzled with the deſcription of his Glory, and Dominion, and conqueſt over his Enemies, and Appearance in the Clouds of Heaven, and the Extent and Eternity of his Kingdom; that all his *Moral* Excellence, by which he gained his Glory, hath eſcaped our Notice: and we have thereby loſt Sight of that great Law of Providence, which he came to teach us, both by his Doctrine and example; that it was by *Perſonal Merit* that he gained a *Perſonal Reward*. Theſe Expectations, and the hopes of Freedom from the *Roman* Power under *Meſſiah* the Prince, ſo filled our Minds; that not even the Apoſtles imagined, that *Chriſt* was to ſuffer and to die, and be raiſed again the third Day. They knew not; that he was to be made *perfect*, by Sufferings(*c*); nor that he *ought* to ſuffer theſe things, before he ſhould enter into his Glory; till *Chriſt* himſelf had explained it to them(*d*).

But the caſe is much more inexcuſable in *Us*; than it was in our Fathers: For *We* are not miſguided by *Their* expectations. If the full accompliſhment of all the glorious Propheſies

(*c*) *Heb.* ii. 10. (*d*) *Mat.* xvii. 22. *Mar.* ix. 31. —viii. 31.—x. 33. *Luke* ix. 22, 24.—xxiv. 7, 26.

of

of the *Meſſiah* triumphant, which were expected to be fulfilled at his *firſt* appearance, did not anſwer their Expectations; as it certainly *did not:* they might ſuſpect ſome Error in the Calculations of the *Time*, to which Numbers or numerical Signs are greatly liable: and might expect all thoſe Propheſies to be fulfilled, in a few years after, by ſome *other* Perſon. But, after the Ruin of the City, there was no room for any ſuch Hopes; this being an indiſputable Date, in which there could be no miſtake.— And, as to the Doctrinal Difficulties, which were formerly ſo great a ſtumbling-block to our Fathers; the *Chriſtians* have explained them to us, in a very conſiſtent manner; and agreeably to our Scriptures. We can plainly ſee; that, what was then expected to be accompliſhed all at *once*, may be accompliſhed at *two* different times; and, conſequently, how the *Meſſiah* may at firſt be in a ſervile and dejected State, and afterwards in a *glorious* and *triumphant Kingdom*; that he might become the Son of Man, by being born into this World; and ſuffer afflictions, and die; and yet riſe again from the dead, and reign to the end of Ages. And therefore, as we are not able *à priori* to ſhew the Improbability of the *Chriſtian* Scheme; nor to conceive any other, that can ſave the Veracity of our Prophets; we are certainly more *inexcuſable* than our Fathers,

thers, if we reject the *Chriſtian* Solution of theſe Difficulties: and that, for this plain Reaſon; becauſe we have no other Reſource. For, as to *our* common Notion, that the *Meſſiah* is to make his *firſt* Appearance in the Clouds of Heaven; it is abſolutely contrary to *our* Scriptures. Our Prophets ſpeak of him as the Son of Man; even when coming in the Clouds of Heaven. *Dan.* vii. 13. And by the ſame Title he was acknowledged by our Fathers, in the days of *Chriſt*; and conſequently, *before* his coming in the Clouds, he muſt be *born of a Woman*. For it can never be imagined; that the Son of Man ſhould enter into the Womb and be born, *after* his appearance in the Clouds of Heaven: becauſe it is the very Circumſtance of his having been born of a Woman, that entitles him to *that name* at his appearance(*e*).

And, farther; as he cannot properly be called the *Son of Man*, till after his *Birth*; ſo

(*e*) *Dan.* vii. 13, 14, 27. When *Daniel* propheſies of the *Meſſiah*, that he ſhall be cut-off; it is ſaid, "And it [viz. *Jeruſalem*] ſhall not be *his*." But, when he is deſcribed as receiving a Kingdom, when he comes in the Clouds of Heaven; it is ſaid, "And it [the Kingdom] ſhall not be left to *other* people;" *Dan.* ii. 44. "But it ſhall be an Everlaſting Dominion, which ſhall not paſs-away." *Dan.* vii. 13, 14, 27. and, conſequently, he will quit it no more. 'T abſurd therefore to imagine; that, after this, he will either be born or die.

neither

neither can he receive the Kingdom, and reign over all, till after his *Death*. For the Prophet *Iſaiah*, ſpeaking of *Meſſiah* in the name of *God*, ſays; "Therefore will I divide him a Portion with the Great, and he ſhall divide the Spoil with the Strong; becauſe he poured-forth his Soul unto Death, and he was numbered with the Tranſgreſſors, and he bare the Sins of Many, and made Interceſſion for the Tranſgreſſors." This was his proper Buſineſs, which he was to perform in the Character of the Son of Man; and for which he was exalted; according to *Iſaiah*: and the *Chriſtian* Scriptures tell us the ſame thing. "As the Father hath Life in *himſelf*; ſo hath he given to the Son to have Life in *himſelf*: and hath given him Authority to execute Judgement alſo; *becauſe he is the Son of Man*(*f*)." And St. *Paul*, ſpeaking upon the ſame ſubject, ſays; that, "being found in faſhion *as a Man*, he humbled himſelf, and became obedient unto Death; even the Death of the Croſs: Wherefore God alſo hath highly exalted him; and given him a Name, that is above every Name." It was this Prophecy of *Iſaiah*, which St. *Peter* referred-to; when he ſaid, the Spirit of God declared by the Prophets, "the Sufferings of *Chriſt*; and the Glory that ſhould follow." And it is upon the ſame Principle, that *Chriſt*

(*f*) *John* v. 27.

himſelf

himſelf ſays; "Ought not *Chriſt* to have ſuffered theſe things, and to enter into his Glory?" for his Glory was the reward of his Sufferings. It was for the ſuffering of Death, that he "was crowned with Glory and Honour; and all things were put in ſubjection under his Feet(*g*)." We ſee then, *Iſaiah* agrees with the *Chriſtians*; that the Sufferings and Death of *Chriſt* are ſo far from being any Reflection upon his Glory and Dignity, that they are the very *Foundation* of his Exaltation and Reward: and, conſequently, it is contrary to the Scriptures to expect, as *we* ſeem to do: that he ſhould appear in the Clouds of Heaven, and receive his Kingdom till he had gained it, as a *judicial Reward* of his Humility and Obedience; by a Life of Suffering and a voluntary Death.

And therefore, though we ſhould admit the ingenious Interpretation of the learned Profeſſor *Michaelis*, in his Letters to Sir *John Pringle*, lately publiſhed; that the Propheſy of *Daniel* [ix. 24, &c.] does not relate to the coming of the *Meſſiah* in the Fleſh, but to his coming to deſtroy *Jeruſalem*; yet, the Concluſion I have drawn from that Propheſy will continue in full force; *viz.* that the *Meſſiah* was foretold to come, before the ruin of the City. For, whether we underſtand by it, that the *Meſſiah* ſhall

(*g*) *Heb.* ii. 9. *Phil.* ii. 8, 9, 10, 11. I *Pet.* i. 11. *Luke* xxiv. 26, 46.

cut-off

cut-off the City and Temple; [ſee *Michaelis* Epiſt. p. 138.] or, according to *Theodotion*, that he ſhall be cut-off himſelf; [as foretold in *Iſ.* liii. 8.] In either Caſe, he muſt not only have come into the World, before theſe Events, in order to become the *Son* of *Man*; but he muſt have ſuffered Death, according to *Iſaiah*; before he could become a *King*, and act with regal Power(*b*).

From

(*b*) I ſhall beg leave here to obſerve, upon what the learned Profeſſor has advanced in page 79; *firſt*, that if *Meſſiah* be a *proper name*, and not a mere *Appellative*, it was as proper to call him *Meſſiah* the *Prince*; as it is, when we take *Chriſt* for a proper Name, to ſay *Chriſt* was the *Meſſiah*. And in this ſenſe the Propheſy agrees with the Profeſſor's opinion; that *Meſſiah*, the *Prince*, [i. e. *Meſſiah*, coming in the Character of a *Prince*,] came to puniſh his rebellious People and Subjects. But if we read *Meſſiah* and the *Prince*; I would aſk, *what* Prince does the Prophet ſpeak-of? It is not likely, the Prince ſpoken of in the next Verſe, as the Prince *of the People who ſhould come*, ſhould be here anticipated in an abſolute manner, merely as *a* Prince, or *the* Prince; when none had been ſpecified.

2. That *Joſephus* ſhould underſtand the word *Meſſiah* to ſignify *Veſpaſian*, [ſee *Michaelis*, p. 108] is highly improbable: he gives not the leaſt intimation of any ſuch notion, and they are diſtinguiſhed in the 26th verſe; one as the *Meſſiah*, and the other as the Prince of the People, who ſhould come and deſtroy the Temple, &c. Whereas all the *Jews* with one conſent agreed that the *Meſſiah* was not only to ariſe in *Judæa*, but to be of the ſeed of *David*. *Deut.* xviii. 15, 19. *Mat.* ii. 1, 6. *John* vii. 42. and be

From hence it appears, that the Prophecies of the *Meſſiah*'s Kingdom, denote theſe two diſtinct and very different States of it.

The

a great Prophet as *David* was, &c. See *Whiſton*'s Diſſertation on the teſtimony of *Joſephus*, concerning *Jeſus Chriſt*, p. 73, 74. *Joſephus*'s miſtake ſeems on the contrary to have ariſen, as I have before obſerved, not from believing *Veſpaſian* to be the *Meſſiah*; but from believing him to be the Prince who ſhould reign over all. Hence aroſe the Difficulty. He could neither account, how the *Meſſiah* ſhould reign over all, and yet be cut-off; as declared by *Iſ.* liii. 8. nor how *Veſpaſian* could anſwer to the Prophefy, which they underſtood was to be accompliſhed by a Prince from among themſelves; οἰκεῖος· according to *Jer.* xxx. 21. See note (*f*), Letter IV. p. 464.

3. I do not imagine the *Hebrew* word *Meſſiah* was ever underſtood by the *Jews* in an abſolute Senſe, to ſignify a *King* in general, or a *Roman Emperor*, any more than a *Roman Prieſt*; at leaſt I humbly conceive, that *Michaelis* hath not proved any ſuch thing; by his Quotations in p. 78: For no *Heathen* Prince is ſpoken-of in thoſe Texts, except *Cyrus*; [*Iſ.* xlv. 1.] whom God raiſed-up to reſtore the Captivity, whom he directed in all his ways, whoſe hand he held to ſubdue Nations, and whom he calls his Shepherd, and declares that he ſhall do all his pleaſure. *Cyrus* therefore might properly be called the *Anointed*, or *Meſſiah*; and yet no propriety ariſe from thence, in uſing the word for a King in general, or a *Roman* Emperor.

4. *Michaelis* objects to the reckoning the *ſeventy* weeks from the Commandment given to rebuild the City, &c. by *Artaxerxes Longimanus*; becauſe it was not the *firſt* command to that purpoſe: for the *firſt* command was given by *Cyrus*. But, for the ſame reaſon, *Michaelis* ſhould not have reckoned the *ſeventy* weeks to end with *Meſſiah and* the

Prince

The *First* State comprehends its riſe, while he ſhould continue on Earth, gathering the children of

Prince; meaning *Veſpaſian:* for the *firſt* Advent of the *Meſſiah* was not ſynchronal with *Veſpaſian.*—But a more important Objection is this; that the *ſecond* Advent of the *Meſſiah* to deſtroy *Jeruſalem*, could not appear to a *Jew* to be any Advent of the *Meſſiah* at all.

3thly. It is true; that the *Jews* are ready enough to allow the Profeſſor's notion, of the *coming of* Chriſt *to deſtroy* Jeruſalem, to be the doctrine of the *new* Teſtament; But then they allow this merely, in order to *oppoſe* its divine Authority. Theſe two Things, ſays Dr. *Allix*, after long Converſation with the *Jews*, I can aſſert for certain: 1ſt. That they look upon thoſe, who imagine the ſecond Coming of *Chriſt* to any other purpoſe than the Salvation of *Iſrael*; not only as men who never read the *old* Teſtament, or miſerably corrupt it; but as men, who do not underſtand the *new* Teſtament; and are therefore not fit to be talked-to.—2dly. That the greateſt obſtacle to their Converſion is made by thoſe Divines; who, from ſome places in the *new* Teſtament ill underſtood, relating to the *ſecond* Coming of the *Meſſiah*, have endeavoured to make out a *ſecond middle* Coming; to deſtroy the *Jewiſh* Nation under *Titus:* and pronounce, that *Chriſt* came a *ſecond* Time; and will come a *third* Time. Now, as the Prophecies of the *old* Teſtament declare *only two* Advents of the *Meſſiah*; hence the *Jews* take a handle to reject the authority of the *new* Teſtament: as you may learn from the diſputation of that very acute *Jew*, R. *Jacob Aben Amram*, againſt the *Chriſtians*. For he underſtands the words of *Chriſt*, Mat. xxiv. 34. *(this generation ſhall not paſs away, till all theſe things are fulfilled;)* in the ſame manner as they are interpreted by ſome *Chriſtian* Divines; to ſignify the Coming of *Chriſt*

of *Jacob* and reſtoring the preſerved of *Iſrael*; in which ſtate he was to be oppreſſed and afflicted:

before the end of the generation in which he lived: From whence he concludes; that the *Chriſtians* have no plea to expect a *ſecond* advent of *Chriſt* at this time of day: ſince *Chriſt* himſelf aſſigned ſo ſhort a time for it: perhaps, while the Apoſtles themſelves were alive. For which he quotes *Mat.* xxiv. 34. *Luke* xxi. 32. *Rev.* xxii. 10—20. And it is certain, if thoſe Texts are fulfilled, his *ſecond* Coming is already paſs'd; and therefore Dr. *Allix* adds, *Viderint Theologi Chriſtiani*, &c. Let the Chriſtian Divines look to it; who, whilſt they maintain ſuch a falſe interpretation of *Chriſt*'s Words, afford the *Jews* an occaſion of beating down the hopes of the *Chriſtians* concerning the *ſecond* Coming of *Chriſt*; and ſo expoſe the *Chriſtian* Faith to the deriſion of the *Jews*. *Et ſic* Judæis *fidem noſtram imprudenter propinant deridendam & exſibilandam*. See *De Meſſiæ duplici adventu diſſert. duæ adverſ.* Judæos; *Præfat.* by *P. Allix*, D. D.

6thly. It was obſerved, in p. 164, that there was no neceſſity, in order to defend the Truth of Chriſtianity, to enter into an exact Calculation of the ſeventy weeks of *Daniel:* but yet the Profeſſor's Objection to the common Interpretation is of ſuch a Nature, that it ſhould not be paſſed-over without Notice. He ſays; "It does not ſufficiently anſwer the Prophet's Prayer.—He prayed for "the City and People; that *They* ſhould return to their "native Country, and their *City* be re-built: whereas the "Anſwer given is about the *Meſſiah*; concerning whom "he neither inquired, nor ſpake a ſingle Word." p. 8. To this it may be replied: that the Prophet's Prayer is as fully anſwered; by declaring that the City ſhould be rebuilt, and laſt ſo many years, till the Death of the *Meſſiah*, and then be deſtroyed; as if no mention had been made of the

flicted: and this ſtate is repreſented by the Prophet as a Stone cut-out without hands; before it encreaſed, and became a Mountain.

The

the *Meſſiah* at all; but only of what was immediately expreſſed in his Prayer.—And, in truth, the *Meſſiah*'s Death, upon which the Fate and Fortune of the City and People entirely depended, was ſo immediately connected with their Deſtruction; that it was merely, becauſe they did not obſerve this very Propheſy; and *receive* the Meſſiah, when *he came unto his own*; or, in other Words, becauſe they knew not the Time of their Viſitation by him; *Luke* xix. 44. of which this Propheſy was a Warning, and a very neceſſary and uſeful Warning; that this Deſtruction was inflicted on them.

7thly. Another notion of the Profeſſor's, upon which it may be proper alſo to remark, is this; that the ſeventy Weeks of Years muſt be ſo many Years of Proſperity: which he endeavours to elucidate, in the ſixty-firſt page, by a compariſon; which does not ſeem at all to come up to the point. *Judica, quæſo, in exemplo: Septem mihi hebdomadum carcer, judicis ſententia, decretus eſt; iis finitis, peto libertatem mihi promiſſam; ſed tamen peto humiliter: advenit miniſter regius, ſudore madens; mihi nuntiat, Regi me Optimatibuſque omnibus in deliciis eſſe; Regemque ſtatim decreviſſe, ut ſeptem adhuc menſes in carcere maneam.* But ſurely, this is not conſidering the Queſtion in the true Light. Did the Honour done to *Daniel* conſiſt in the Subject matter of the Revelation? No, ſurely; but in the Revelation itſelf. It was, becauſe he was highly favoured; that it was given him to underſtand, what ſhould befall his People in the latter days: ch. x. 14. and the Propheſy or Subject-matter was the Truth: ch. xi. 2. and this could not be altered, for the better or the worſe, merely to pleaſe

the

The *second* State of it comprehends his coming in the Clouds of Heaven, as the Son of Man; to

the *Prophet*; but depended entirely upon the conduct of the *Nation*. Nor could it ſerve the purpoſe the Profeſſor ſuppoſes; though it were allowed, that they were all to be Years of Happineſs: for, on the one hand, the Propheſy reaches much beyond the ſeventy Weeks; quite to the Deſtruction of the City, and all the Evils which were to be poured upon the Deſolate: and, on the other hand, the Prophet was well informed of the happy State of his People: when the Son of Man ſhould appear in the Clouds. ch. ii. 44. vii. 27.—Beſides, we know, from the Prophet himſelf, that the beginning of theſe Weeks was to be in troubleſome Times: ch. ix. 25. and, when *Daniel* ſpeaks of theſe Times in the eleventh chapter, he never hints at the Happineſs of them; but rather the contrary: ch. xi. 16. and, after the Empire was tranſlated from the *Medes* and *Perſians* to the *Greeks*, it is well known, that the Succeſſors of *Alexander* were very bad Neighbours to the *Jews*; who, lying between the Kingdoms of *Syria* and *Egypt*, were continually harraſſed and oppreſſed by one or other of them.

Laſtly; when we conſider the great Uncertainty, ariſing from the various Readings of the Text; and the variety of Senſes, put upon thoſe various Readings by the Learned: when we conſider the difference of the ſeveral Chronologies, which are uſed upon theſe points, all defended by Men of Learning; and the very little Satisfaction, or rather the great Perplexity, which the Mind feels from the many critical Niceties which are brought into the Diſpute: it ſeems reaſonable to conclude, upon the whole; that the Proof of Chriſtianity cannot poſſibly depend, at this time of day, upon ſuch precarious Evidence; how great ſoever its influence might have been in former days, when theſe things were better underſtood: whereas, if we truſt to the

grand

to reign over all, to the end of Ages: after the Stone ſhall have ſmitten the Image, repreſenting the four great Monarchies, upon the Feet that were of Iron and Clay, and broken them to pieces; and ſhall become a great Mountain, and fill the Earth(*i*).—The latter part of the Propheſy therefore ſtill remains to be fulfilled: And the circumſtances, relating to it in the Old and New Teſtament, are exactly parallel. But, with regard to the *firſt* of theſe States, in which the *Meſſiah* is repreſented to be oppreſſed and afflicted; the *Jews* and *Chriſtians* differ greatly: the *Chriſtians* conſidering it as already paſs'd; and compleatly fulfilled, as recorded by the Evangeliſts; whereas *our* Maſters are neither able to explain the Texts which relate to this,

grand outlines, in which all the Commentators are agreed; they muſt for-ever form ſo impregnable a Bulwark of Chriſtianity, that the learned Profeſſor can have no ſolid ground to be ſo apprehenſive of danger from their differing in their Interpretations from Him; *ut hic potius cuniculos timeat:* p. 11. the Outworks being entire, according to all their different and oppoſite Syſtems; and not to be undermined.

(*i*) *Dan.* ii. 35. Mr. *Joſeph Mede*, ſpeaking of this State ſays; "Hoc eſt Regnum illud *ampliſſimum*; non illud Lapidis, ſuperſtite adhuc Monarchiarum ſerie, ex Monte abſciſſi; [nam hic præſens Regni *Chriſti* ſtatus eſt:] ſed Lapidis, iiſdem funditus comminutis & deletis, in Montem evaſuri, atque univerſum impleturi Terrarum Orbem." p. 532.

See the Agreement of the Old and New Teſtament, upon the Event of this Propheſy, in a Note hereafter.

State,

State, though the date of it be long ago out; nor do they endeavour at it: but ſeem to have given it over in deſpair; though, as I obſerved, it is as much a Part of the *Meſſiah*'s Character and Hiſtory, and as neceſſary therefore to be underſtood and explained, as the glorious State that was to follow it.

The *Chriſtians*, on the other hand, though perfectly right in explaining many Texts to relate to the humble State of the *Meſſiah*; yet ſeem to have added many others to them, which relate purely to the time of his future Advent in a ſtate of Glory, as a Prince. And perhaps, as to the Queſtion, what Propheſies are already fully accompliſhed, and what not; it *cannot* be always determined with certainty; nor is it neceſſary always, that it *ſhould* be; becauſe a Propheſy, which was intended to relate in ſome particulars to the *firſt* Coming of *Chriſt*, may be more fully compleated at his *ſecond* Coming; and a Propheſy, capable of a *figurative* ſenſe, may in *that* ſenſe be fulfilled, at his *firſt* coming; and yet more properly relate to, and be accompliſhed *literally*, at his *ſecond* coming: and in many Caſes it may not be certain, *which* of the Advents the words may moſt properly belong to.—Theſe Queſtions may be the ſubject of Altercation between Commentators: but the Truth of *Chriſtianity* will be no further concerned in it, than this; that

all

all the indefenſible Tenets of injudicious *Chriſtians* are greedily catched-at by their Adverſaries, as if they were the doctrines of *Chriſtianity*; and objected-to, as ſuch, to the diſadvantage of *Chriſtianity* itſelf.

But the *Jews* can by no means juſtly argue; that, becauſe the *Chriſtians* are not able to prove the Advent of *Chriſt* from *ſome* particular Texts that have been *preſſed* into the Service; therefore *other* Texts are alſo obſcure, and incapable of proving it: or that *many* Texts, taken together, may not *elucidate* one another; and make the truth appear much more clear and undeniable, than any *ſingle* Text can do of itſelf alone: or that, becauſe the Texts referred-to have not been *fully* accompliſhed, therefore they have never been fulfilled *in part*. The Conſequence will not follow; and, if it did, it would prove too much: for, if the Propheſies relating to his *firſt* coming have never been fulfilled *in part*; they never can be fulfilled *at all*: the dates of his *firſt* coming being long ſince out. Such is the Danger of arguing too raſhly upon the Subject. But the Truth ſeems to be, as Sir *Iſaac Newton* has very juſtly obſerved; that "there is ſcarce a Propheſy, which relates to the *firſt* Coming of *Chriſt*; but what does, in *ſome particular* or *other*, relate to his *ſecond* Coming(*k*).

(*k*) Sir *Iſaac Newton* on the Proph. p. 40.

This Obſervation would put an end to the Errors both of the *Jews* and *Chriſtians*, in their Interpretations of many Texts; by explaining them in ſuch a manner, as to allow a *partial* Accompliſhment, at his *firſt* coming, as a *Prophet*; and prepare us to expect a *full* Completion of what remains to be fulfilled of the ſame Propheſy, at his *ſecond* Appearance, as a *Prince*. And; if the *Chriſtians* would not expoſe themſelves to *us*, by interpreting thoſe Texts, as if they were already fulfilled, and related to the *preſent* ſtate of *Chriſtianity*; which we ſee and know have never yet been accompliſhed, and plainly relate to *Futurity*; and if, on the other hand, *our* People would not overlook thoſe Propheſies; which declare, that the *Meſſiah* would *make his Soul an offering for Sin, and pour-out his Soul unto Death*; for which he was to be rewarded with Power: but conſider, that it is impoſſible thoſe Propheſies ſhould be true, upon any other than *Chriſtian* Principles: If we would throw-off our prejudices, on *both* ſides; we ſhould act much more like Philoſophers, much more like Men worthy to be truſted with a divine Revelation, and probably with *much better Succeſs* in the Interpretation of Scripture; than we ever have done yet, or can ever hope to do; while we look upon each other as Enemies and Bigots.

No

No man has ſpoken ſo well upon this Subject as Sir *Iſaac Newton*. That great Philoſopher and Divine had none of that little paltry Reſentment, againſt thoſe who differed from him in religious opinions; which generally infects the contracted and illiberal mind. He was ſuperior to the ſervice of any Hypotheſis whatever, any farther than he was led by Reaſon and Conviction. He had nobler and more extenſive views into Futurity, than to confine his Ambition to this World; and uſed the Underſtanding with which God had endowed him above other Men; not, in preaching up the Doctrine of *occult Qualities* in Philoſophy, and *Myſteries* too ſacred to be inquired into in Religion; not, in depreciating God's former Revelations, and proſtituting Truth and *Chriſtianity* to the Intereſt of Politicians and his own Advancement; not, in courting the Applauſe and Admiration of Men: but, with a noble Freedom of Thought, to the Confuſion of all modern Bigots, Unbelievers, and minute Philoſophers, fearleſsly purſued the Paths of Truth with all his Power; as the ſure Road to lead him up to the firſt Almighty Cauſe. In like manner, in the Study of Revelation, he ſcorned to confine his Inquiries by the Opinions of *Men*; and allowed of no Authority over his Belief, except the Word of *God* (*l*). And, ac-

(*l*) See Letter I. p. 146.

cordingly, he makes no ſcruple to confeſs; that the preſent ſtate of *Chriſtianity* is far from *perfect*: that all Nations have *corrupted* it: and that the Truth, as it is in the Scriptures, hath been long loſt; according to the Propheſies, that ſo it would be.

The Prophets and Apoſtles, he informs us, have foretold; that, "as *Iſrael* often revolted and brake the Covenant, and upon Repentance renewed it; ſo there ſhould be a *falling away* among the *Chriſtians*, ſoon after the days of the Apoſtles: and that, in the *latter* days, God would deſtroy the impenitent; and make a new Covenant with his People. And the giving Ear to the Prophets, reckoning *Moſes*, and the Apoſtles, and *Chriſt* himſelf among them; is the Sign of the *true* Church(*m*)." This is the ſame deſcription of it, which St. *John* gives in the *Apocalypſe*; as conſiſting of thoſe, who keep the Commandments of God, and the Teſtimony of *Jeſus Chriſt*(*n*).—But, where ſhall we find the *Chriſtian* Church, that has made this the Rule of her Faith; and not rather followed after Philoſophy, and vain Deceits; or added to the Scripture Doctrines, Articles of human Compoſition, after the Traditions and Commandments of Men; after the Rudiments of

(*m*) Sir *Iſaac Newton* on the Propheſies; p. 13.

(*n*) *Rev.* xii. 27. and Sir *Iſaac Newton*; p. 279.

this

this World, and not after *Chriſt* (*o*)?—But this great Man does at once deliver us from all theſe Incumbrances, and direct us into Truth; by truſting entirely to the Scriptures, (of which the modern Political and Deïſtical Divines have made a Noſe of Wax:) which will render our Reſearches not only more eaſy, but more ſafe and certain.—Such a temper of Mind, ſuch a reach of Underſtanding and Sagacity in the Search of Truth; ſuch noble, liberal, and benevolent Principles, demand our ſtricteſt Attention; *Si Patriæ volumus, ſi Nobis vivere cari.*

Excuſe me this Excurſion; which flows involuntary from my Pen, when I think of Sir *Iſaac Newton*'s Writings; whoſe words I ſhall now quote, as an Enſign of Peace thrown-out for an amicable Congreſs of the *Jews* and *Chriſtians*; or rather the preliminary Article of Reconciliation between them.

Speaking of the *Apocalypſe*, he ſays; "The Folly of Interpreters hath been, to *foretel* things by this Propheſy; as if God deſigned to make *them* Prophets. By this Raſhneſs they have not only expoſed themſelves; but brought the Propheſy alſo into Contempt. The Deſign of God was much otherwiſe. He gave this, and the Propheſies of the Old Teſtament; not to gratify Men's Curioſities, by enabling *them* to foreknow things; but that, after they were

(*o*) *Col.* ii. 8. Letter I. p. 8, 9.

ful-

fulfilled, they might be interpreted by the *Event*; and his *own* Providence, not that of the *Interpreters*, be then manifeſted thereby to the World. For the Event of things predicted many ages before, will then be a convincing Argument, that the World is governed by Providence. For, " as the *Few* and *Obſcure* Propheſies concerning *Chriſt's firſt* Coming, were for the ſetting up the *Chriſtian* Religion, which all Nations have ſince corrupted; ſo the *Many* and *Clear* Propheſies concerning the things to be done at *Chriſt's ſecond* Coming, are not only for predicting, but alſo for effecting, a Recovery of the *long-loſt* Truth; and ſetting-up a Kingdom, wherein dwelleth Righteouſneſs." The Event will prove the *Apocalypſe*; and this Propheſy, thus proved and underſtood, will open the old Prophets, and altogether make known the true Religion, and eſtabliſh it.—And again, he obſerves; that " the Propheſies, already fulfilled, are but few and obſcure; in Compariſon with thoſe main and ſignal Revolutions, predicted by all the Prophets; which, when they come to paſs, will at once both turn Men's Eyes upon conſidering the Predictions; and plainly interpret them(*p*)."

Here we ſee the great Neceſſity there is, both for the *Jews* and *Chriſtians*, to ſtudy the Scripture Propheſies with care and diligence;

(*p*) Sir *Iſaac Newton*; p. 251, 252.

and

and eſpecially the *Jews*: that having miſtaken the Signs of the *firſt* Coming of the *Meſſiah*, as a *Prophet*; they may be the more careful to obſerve the Signs of his *ſecond* Coming, as their *King*.

But even here I muſt obſerve; that they are not to be led implicitly by the *Chriſtian* Interpretations. For, even thoſe Propheſies which foretell the ſecond Coming of *Chriſt*; and relate to thoſe main and ſignal Revolutions, which have been predicted by all the Prophets; and are very clear and numerous; have many of them been rendered *ambiguous* and *uncertain*, by the figurative Interpretations, which have been *arbitrarily impoſed upon them* by the *Chriſtians*.

Of this *Orobio* complains to *Limborch*; and not without Reaſon. " The Temple, ſays he, which was deſcribed by *Ezekiel*, will hereafter be *literally* built; and the War with *Gog* and *Magog really* happen; and *Iſrael*, the houſe of *Jacob* and *Judah*, according to the *Fleſh*, ſhall come from all Countries and all Nations, in the Name of *Adonai*, to *Jeruſalem*. This is the *Letter* and *Literal* Senſe, manifeſtly; which you *Chriſtians* will never admit-of: but are reſolved to underſtand the Temple to be *myſtical*, the War to be *myſtical*, the *Iſrael* to be *myſtical*; and in like manner all the literal Propheſies, except what ſerves your own Schemes,

or

or at leaſt does not thwart them: and theſe you allow to be underſtood *literally*(q)."

But, however ſlightly ſome *Chriſtians* may paſs-over theſe Propheſies; Sir *Iſaac Newton*, with others of the learned, underſtand and explain them literally: not imagining they have a right to caſt-away the *literal* Senſe, and adopt a *figurative* one; without a good and ſubſtantial Reaſon. Thus, when the Prophet *Daniel* reveals to *Nebuchadnezzar* the Propheſy of the *four* great Monarchies; (which literally ſucceeded one another upon Earth, as he deſcribes:) and then aſſures him, that theſe ſhall be ſucceeded by a *fifth*; which all Dominions ſhould ſerve and obey: what ſubſtantial Reaſon, or Rule of good Criticiſm, will teach us to explain this *fifth* Kingdom to be merely *figurative*, and erected only in the Hearts of Men? Was there not a *literal* Theocracy over the *Jews*? Was not *Chriſt* ſuppoſed even by the *Chriſtians* to be their *King*; in a more *literal* Senſe than this? Did he not fight their Battles, and preſide over them, and inſtruct them; being *literally* and *perſonally* preſent in the Tabernacle? And is it reaſonable for the *Chriſtians* to expect, at his *ſecond* coming as their King, a leſs *perſonal* Preſence and Theocracy over the whole World, now his Rule is extended to the *Gentiles*; than what was manifeſted formerly over

(q) *Limborch*, Amica Collat. p. 22.

the

the *Jews?* There can be no Reaſon for this. The return of the Theocracy being as plainly revealed to the *Chriſtians*, as it was promiſed at firſt to the *Jews*. See *Rev.* xxi. 3. "Behold, the Tabernacle of God is with Men; and he will dwell with them, and they ſhall be his People; and God himſelf ſhall be with them, and be their God;" and compare it with *Lev.* xxvi. 11, 12. "I will ſet my Tabernacle among you, and my Soul ſhall not abhor you; and I will walk among you, and will be your God; and ye ſhall be my People(*r*).

Our Fathers had certainly much more reaſon to ſuſpect the Propheſy of the *Meſſiah*'s Death to be a *myſterious* and *figurative* Propheſy only; how plainly ſoever the ſenſe of the words may at preſent appear to the *Chriſtians:* even though they had believed him to be the *Angel* of the *Covenant*; as it is revealed by *Malachi*. For, though they were not inſenſible of the great Love of him, "who had led them out of *Egypt*, and was afflicted in all their Afflictions, and whoſe Soul was grieved for their Miſeries; who redeemed them, and carried them all the days of old;" yet it was no eaſy matter for them to believe, that this great and glorious Being would actually become *a Man* for their ſakes; and make his Soul an offering for Sin, and ſuffer Pain and Death. The Infinity of ſuch Love and Condeſcenſion could not but render the Pro-

(*r*) See alſo *Ezek.* xxxvii. 26, 27, 28. and *Rev.* xxii. 3, 4.

phesy very liable to be understood in a figurative and implicit Sense.—But the case is very different with the *Christians*. Those, who believe that the Son of God was *literally* born of a Woman, and did *literally* descend from Heaven; and that God so loved the World, as *literally* to give him up to Pain and Death for their Sakes; can never be forced by any considerations, to give-up the *literal* Sense of his return to Earth, and the Restoration of the Theocracy, and his personal Life and Reign among Men. Even the *Jews* could reason from the personal appearance of *Jehovah to Moses*, that he would again appear in a human Form; and so they explained *Isaiah* xxv. 9. "And it shall be said in that day, Lo! this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us; this is the *Lord*, [*Jehovah*,] we will rejoice and be glad in his Salvation:" Upon which *Grotius* observes, that in the *Talmud* in *Taanith* it is said; "when the time there spoken-of shall come, *Jehovah* shall be shewn as it were with the finger; *i. e.* Men shall be able to point him out to others; saying, there is *Jehovah*."

Mr. *Joseph Mede* says; "the Presence of *Christ* in his Kingdom shall no doubt be glorious; yet I dare not so much as imagine, that it shall be a *visible* Converse on Earth: For the Kingdom of *Christ* ever hath been, and shall be a Kingdom whose Throne and Kingly Residence is in Heaven(*x*)." It is true, that "the Kingly Residence

(*x*) On the Millennium; p. 605.

shall

ſhall be in Heaven," and ſo it was in the days of the *Theocracy*; and yet the *Angel* of the *Covenant* was perſonally preſent on the Mercy-ſeat, and actually converſed with *Moſes*, as one Man does with another.

And, though the Interpreters of Scripture are often liable to Errors, from adhering too ſtrictly to the literal Senſe; as perhaps the *Jews* may be in this place: yet the caſe is no leſs dangerous, when they deviate from a literal Senſe; without ſufficient Reaſon for it. For, there can be no Truth gained; by running into Extremes on either Side: and how far to go, requires in many Caſes a very nice judgment(*s*).

Let not the *Chriſtians* therefore think, that they honour the *Meſſiah*; by inſiſting that he hath already fully accompliſhed thoſe Propheſies, which will not be literally fulfilled till his ſecond Advent: nor imagine, they are doing ſervice to the *Chriſtian* Cauſe; by depriving the *Children of* Abraham *according to the Fleſh* of their hopes in the Promiſes, which are to be accompliſhed in the latter times; by forcing a *figurative* Senſe upon *literal* Propheſies, and confining thoſe Scriptures to mean only a *ſpiritual* and *fi-*

(*s*) The Judicious Reader will obſerve many miſtakes of this kind, as well in R. *Saadias'* eighth Treatiſe, as in the Remarks upon it, by Dr. P. *Allix*, in a book entitled a Confutation of the hopes of the Jews, concerning the laſt Redemption. In which the Jew and Chriſtian ſeem to be equally erroneous, upon different Texts.

gurative Iſrael, which manifeſtly relate to the Call and Reſtoration of our whole Nation, and the Return of the Theocracy, which has been ſo long ſuſpended; when *Jehovah* ſhall again be *Their* God, and they ſhall be *His* People. And let not *Us*, merely to oppoſe the *Chriſtians*, deny the accompliſhment of thoſe Propheſies; which, if not already accompliſhed, never can be: and thereby deſtroy the Credit of our own Prophets. Let us not reject what is plain and intelligible, and hath already come to paſs; upon account of what is more obſcure, and only unintelligible becauſe not yet fulfilled; but conſider, that *Philo* and *Joſephus*, and all wiſe Men, argue from the accompliſhment of ſome Propheſies, to the Belief of all the Reſt, which are derived from the ſame Authority: and, if *we* do not reaſon in the ſame manner as *they* did, we lay our Scriptures open and indefenſible to the Arguments of the Deiſts and Atheiſts; and particularly, to this unavoidable Conſequence; that, if we do not allow of the *Chriſtian* Scriptures, we ſhall not be able to defend *our own*.

Having thus conſidered the Queſtion between the *Jews* and *Chriſtians*; and ſhewn, that *Jeſus* of *Nazareth* hath accompliſhed the Propheſies, in all thoſe capital Points I have ſpoken-to; to wit, his *Lineage*, the *Place* of his *Birth*, the *Time* of his *Advent*, and his *Actions*; and that all the other Propheſies, not yet fulfilled, are capable of being accompliſhed by Him, when he appears in the Clouds of Heaven; and the whole

of

of them incapable of accompliſhment by any *other Perſon*: it ſeems to follow unavoidably, that *Jeſus* is the *Chriſt*.

The few Objections which remain, and which I ſcarce believe any of us lay any great Streſs upon; I ſhall now go on to anſwer: and

1. The different States of Affliction and Glory, in which the *Meſſiah* is deſcribed in our Scriptures, appear ſo very plain; that many of our Writers have endeavoured to account for them, by imagining there were to be Two *Meſſiahs*: One the Son of *Joſeph*, of the Family of *Ephraim*; who is to come in a State of Humiliation and Suffering, and is to be put to Death: the Other, the Son of *David*; who is to come in a State of Triumph and Exaltation, and to bring the former one to Life again. But this is a mere Suppoſition, without any Proof; and ſerves no Purpoſe. For, if *Meſſiah*, the Son of *Joſeph*, might ſuffer; why might not *Meſſiah*, the Son of *David*? This is like the Hereſy of the *Chriſtians*; that there is a *Chriſt*, who came down from Heaven; and is incapable of ſuffering, becauſe he is the *ſupreme* God: and a *Chriſt*, capable of ſuffering; who did not come down from Heaven, and was born of the Virgin *Mary*: Or, in other words; that *Chriſt* ſuffered only in the human Nature. And beſides, this Notion is directly contrary to the words of *Iſaiah*; who informs us, that the Perſon who is to *ſuffer*, is the ſame with him that is to be *exalted*: It is the ſame, who "pours-out his

his Soul unto death; that divides the Spoil with the Strong (*t*):" the ſame, "whoſe Viſage was marred more than any Man, and his Form more than the Sons of Men;" that was to be "extolled and exalted (*u*):" and to imagine One *Meſſiah* to go through Sufferings and Death, and an Other to be rewarded with the Spoil, is inconſiſtent with the Prophet's Doctrine; who tells us, he ſhall be rewarded with the *Spoil*, for that very Reaſon; "becauſe he poured-out his Soul unto Death."

Another Opinion is, that the *Meſſiah* delayed his Coming, upon Account of our Sins. But this is a contradiction to the Propheſy of *Malachi*; who connects his Advent with terrible Denunciations of his Wrath, and deſcribes the Wickedneſs of the *Jews* at that time to be very great; and ſays, he is to be "a ſwift Witneſs againſt the Sorcerers and Adulterers, and againſt falſe Swearers, and againſt thoſe that oppreſs the Hireling, the Fatherleſs, and Widow, and turn away the Stranger from his Right(*x*)." And in the ivth Chapter he ſays; that it was to prevent this Deſtruction and Puniſhment, that *Elias* was ſent before him to give Notice of his Coming; "leaſt he ſhould come and ſmite the Earth with a Curſe(*y*)." And both *Malachi* and *Zechariah* agree; that it was by Puniſhment, that our Nation was to be "tried and refined." *Mala-*

(*t*) *Iſaiah* liii. 12. (*u*) *Iſaiah* lii. 13, 14.
(*x*) *Mal.* iii. 5. (*y*) *Mal.* iv. 6.

chi

chi ſays, "he ſhall ſit as a Refiner and Purifier of Silver; and he ſhall purify the Sons of *Levi*, and purge them as Gold and Silver; that they may offer to the Lord an Offering in Righteouſneſs(z)." And *Zechariah* ſays, "I will bring the third part through the Fire; and will refine them, as Silver is refined: and I will try them, as Gold is tried(*a*)." And they both agree, that this Puniſhment ſhould reform and amend them. "Then, ſays *Malachi*, ſhall the Offering of *Judah* and *Jeruſalem* be pleaſant unto the Lord; as in the days of old, and as in former years." And *Zechariah* ſays; "After this they ſhall call on my name, and I will hear them; and I will ſay, it is *my* People; and they ſhall ſay, *Jehovah* is *my* God." The *Meſſiah* therefore did not delay his Coming, upon the Account of their Sins; but came to reform and amend, and puniſh. And therefore *Grotius* obſerves, very juſtly; "It were moſt unreaſonable to ſay, that his Coming was deferred, upon account of that very Diſeaſe, which he was particularly deſigned to cure."

3. Some of our Rabbins argue, againſt the *Chriſtians*; that the *Jews* are ſaid to be ſaved, in the days of the *Meſſiah*; whereas, in the days

(z) *Mal.* iii. 3.

(*a*) *Zech.* xiii. 9. The Prophets *Malachi* and *Zechariah* are here quoted more particularly; becauſe they lived after the return from the ſeventy years' Captivity: and therefore theſe Propheſies relate to ſome future Times.

of

of *Chriſt*, they were moſt grievouſly diſperſed(*b*). But, in this Argument, the Times of the *firſt* and *ſecond* Advents of *Chriſt* are not diſtinguiſhed; and neither the grievous Affliction, that were to attend his firſt Advent, as foretold by the Prophets, taken any notice of; nor the Salvation of thoſe that believed.

4. Some, who are convinced by their Propheſies, as well as by Tradition, that the Temple was to continue till the Days of the *Meſſiah*; have invented an idle Story—(in order to prevent the *Chriſtians* from availing themſelves of ſuch an important Conceſſion) that *Chriſt* was indeed *born*, under the *ſecond* Temple; but is concealed at *Rome*, till God ſhall permit him to reveal himſelf(*c*). If this be true; it is incumbent upon the Aſſerters of it, to inform us, how they know that he is there; and how they come to give themſelves no concern to enquire after him.

That he was ſo far concealed from the main body of our Nation, when he came, as not to be known by them; is undoubted. It is confeſſed by the Apoſtle *Paul*, as the Reaſon why they condemned him; that they knew him not, neither the voice of the Prophets that were read to them every Sabbath-Day(*d*). And *Chriſt*

(*b*) *Raimundus Martinus*, in his *Pugio Fidei*; Part. II. cap. ii. ſays; "*Judæi* hic ſalvandi dicuntur in diebus *Meſſiæ*, &c. quum in diebus *Jeſu* graviſſime diſſipali ſunt." See *Poli* Synopſ. 848.

(*c*) Biſhop *Chandler*; p. 83. (*d*) *Acts* xiii. 27.

him-

himſelf apologizes for them in his Prayer to God, for the ſame Reaſon; as far as their Caſe could poſſibly admit of any Alleviation: "*Father*, forgive them; for they know not what they do(*e*)." And our Prophets have foretold, that it would ſo happen. *Iſaiah* begins this Subject by ſaying, "Who hath believed our Report(*f*)?" And tells us the Reaſon, why they did not know him. It was becauſe "they hid as it were their Faces from him; he was deſpiſed, and we eſteemed him not." They were not ignorant; that there was a Perſon, in the days of *Tiberius*, who aſſumed the Character of the *Meſſiah*; and St. *John* had warned them of his Coming: and when He came, "He ſtretched out his hands all day to a rebellious People(*g*);" offering them the ſame Credentials, upon which the whole Evidence of *their own* Religious Faith was founded; i. e. *Miracles* and *Propheſy*: but they hid their Faces from him, and would not receive him: When he did the Works of the Father, they ſaw and owned the *Works*; but did not acknowledge the *Power*, that wrought them; but aſcribed them to Magic Art(*h*). They allowed,

(*e*) *Luke* xxiii. 34. (*f*) *Iſaiah* liii. 1, 3. (*g*) *Ib.* lxv. 1, 2.

(*h*) *Maimonides* de Fund. Legis, cap. viii. ſays; *Iſraelitæ* non crediderunt *Moſi*, propter Miracula quæ patravit: quia animo credentis propter ſigna ineſſe poteſt ſuſpicio; fieri poſſe, ut quis miraculum fecerit per incantationem aut præſtigias."—And *Vorſtius* in his Notes obſerves; that,

lowed, that Miracles might be wrought by an Impoſtor, in Proof of a falſe Religion; uncontrouled by God; and therefore deſtroyed the Proof for the Divinity of their own Religion. And, as they would not liſten to the Voice of

among the Miracles, which may be performed by the Stars or by Magic. *Albo* reckons [lib. i. c. viii.] *Eliſha*'s recalling the Dead to Life, his curing *Naaman*'s Leproſy, the Deliverance of *Daniel* from the Lion's Den, and of *Jonah* from the Whale's Belly; upon which he ſays, "Nihil non nugaciſſimi Mortalium fingunt"—theſe moſt egregious Triflers invent any thing; to avoid being obliged to confeſs, that Our *Jeſus* performed his Miracles by the Power, and as it were the Finger of God.

Our Rabbins therefore have very imprudently uſed the ſame Arguments againſt the *Chriſtians*; which *Apuleius* and *Pliny* uſed againſt *Moſes*: and the Anſwers to the Objections of the Heathens will be a ſufficient Defence of the *Chriſtians*. *Plin.* lib. XXV. c. i. *Apul.* Apol. ii. quoted by *Grotius*, de Verit. lib. V. c. iii. not. 12, 13. We are told by *Limborch*, ſpeaking of *Orobio* the *Jew*; "hoc ſuo ſcripto contendit, etiamſi hæc miracula facta eſſent, tamen non debuiſſe nec potuiſſe *Judæos Jeſum* agnoſcere eſſe *Meſſiam*. p. 259. *Orobio* contended; that, though the Miracles [of *Chriſt*] had been actually performed, yet that the *Jews* neither could, nor ought to have received him as the *Meſſiah*: And, what is very ſtrange to conſider, even the *Chriſtian* Fathers ſeem to have looked upon Miracles in the ſame light. *Athenagoras* ſays, we do not deny extraordinary Acts to have been performed in the name of Idols; and theſe, he tells us, were performed by *Dæmons*. Apol. xxv. *Middleton*; p. 77. And Mr. *Farmer* [on Miracles; p. 128.] obſerves, "Non eſt autem grande facere Signa; *'Tis no great matter to perform Miracles*;" to have been the common Principle both of *Porphyry* and *Jerom*.

Miracles,

Miracles, confirmed by the accompliſhment of *Propheſy*; with regard to a Revelation, which was agreeable to the Nature of *God*, and calculated for the Benefit of *Man*; it was neceſſary for God, in order to carry-on the Courſe of his Revelations by the *Meſſiah*, to gather ſuch Perſons into his Church or Kingdom; as were ready to receive him, upon proper Evidence of his Miſſion: and to deliver his Revelation to Poſterity upon ſuch Principles, as would at the ſame time ſupport and defend his former Revelations to *Moſes* and the Prophets. And therefore, when *Iſrael* would not be gathered to him, he was given to be a Light to the *Gentiles*; for God would not deprive the World of the Benefit of his Revelation, upon account of our Father's obſtinacy. So that the whole Hiſtory of the Coming of *Chriſt*, and our Rejecting him, and his Reception by the *Gentiles*, hath been foretold by our own Prophets; juſt as it hath happened. "I am ſought of them that aſked not for me," ſays *Iſaiah*, in the name of the *Meſſiah*; "I am found of them that ſought me not. I ſaid, behold me, behold me, unto a Nation that was not called by my Name;" *Iſ.* lxv. 1, 2. "I have ſpread-out my hands all day to a rebellious People." It appears then; that they knew him not, becauſe they *hid their Faces* from him; and would not liſten to his Doctrine, nor to the Voice of the Prophets who had foretold Him.

And, what ſeems above all to condemn *Us*, as without excuſe, and at the ſame time to defend the Interpretation of the *Chriſtians*; thoſe very Doctrines, which *we* ſo vehemently oppoſe, have been known and allowed-of by our own ancient Commentators; as what was in Reaſon to be expected, according to the natural Senſe of the Propheſies. So that it is plain, the *Chriſtian* Interpretation of them is by no means a forced one; and might have been ſeen by us, if we had been unprejudiced; as well as it was by thoſe that lived before us.

Dr. *Whitby*, on I. *Pet.* ii. 20. gives us the Opinion of the ancient *Jews*, as follows. "When God created the World, he held-forth his Hand under the Throne of Glory; and created the Soul of the *Meſſiah*, and his Company: and ſaid to him; Wilt thou heal and redeem my Sons, after 6000 years? He anſwered, Yes. God ſaid to him; If ſo, wilt thou bear Chaſtiſements; to expiate their Iniquity? (according to what is written, *Iſ.* liii. 4. "Surely he hath borne our Griefs;) He anſwered, I will; and bear them with Joy(*i*)."

R. *Moſes Hadarſon* ſays; R. *Abba* taught, that the *Meſſiah* was to undertake a State of Sufferings, in order to gain Life to Mankind. For he makes the *Meſſiah* thus addreſs himſelf to God. "Lord of the World, it is with Joy

(*i*) *Cartw.* Mellif. l. I. p. 2974. *Whitby* on *Eph.* i. 4.

that

that I undertake to ſuffer all this Tribulation and Anguiſh (beforementioned) upon this Condition; that in my days you will bring all the Dead to Life; from the firſt, *Adam*, to that very time—Then ſaid the holy and bleſſed God, I conſent: And forthwith the *Meſſiah* undertook all thoſe Tribulations and Afflictions: as it is written in *Iſaiah* liii.

And again R. *Moſes Hadarſon*, in his Comment on *Pſ.* lxxii. 9. ſays; "R. *Natroni* aſked, what doth that mean? We ſee not our Signs; there is no more any Prophet; neither is there among us any who knoweth how long. To whom R. *Abba* anſwered; this is ſaid of that wicked Generation, who will not believe the Signs or Miracles which our holy *Meſſiah* will perform; but ſhall ſay of him, that he doeth theſe things by *Art Magic*. And that thoſe Miracles which he ſhall perform are not the Miracles which were predicted of the *Meſſiah*. And that, as there is no Prophet to ſet the Truth before them; if he doth not bring ſome proof of the Truth of his Aſſertions, they will put him to Death(*k*)."

Here then we ſee our ancient Rabbins, who were unprejudiced upon this Subject, interpret the Prophets as the *Chriſtians* do; that the *Meſſiah* was to ſuffer Affliction and Death: and that the Reaſon, why he ſhould not be acknow-

(*k*) Biſhop *Clayton*'s Impartial Enquiry; p. 37, 50.

ledged

ledged by our Fathers, in his afflicted State, would be; becauſe they would hide their Faces from him, and refuſe his Credentials.

Theſe Rabbins were not ſo ſcandaliſed at the Sufferings of the *Meſſiah*; as with the thoughts of his being put to death by our *own Nation*. For they not only collected from the Prophets, that he ſhould ſuffer and die; but that it would be by the hands of our *Fathers*. And though there be no Text, that expreſsly declares this; yet, if we look into the Scriptures, we ſhall not be at any loſs to find upon what Reaſons ſuch an Opinion was founded.

For, when *Iſaiah* tells us of his Death; [ch. liii.] he gives us an Account of the Scorn and Hatred with which our Nation would receive him. He tells us, that "he was deſpiſed and rejected of *Men*:" but of *what* Men could he be rejected, but thoſe to whom he was ſent? The ſame, of whom the Prophet ſays; "*We* hid, as it were, our Faces from him; he was deſpiſed; and *We* [that is, We *Jews*] eſteemed him not." And xlix. 7. he calls him, "*Him* whom Man deſpiſeth, whom the Nation abhorreth." And *Zechariah* ſpeaks more plainly, [xii. 10.] which words R. *Hadarſon*, juſt quoted, underſtood of the *Meſſiah*(*l*). "I will pour

(*l*) Referunt hæc vulgo Rabbini ad *Davidem* filium *Joſephi*; quem occubaturum aiunt in prælio contra *Geg*.

At

pour upon the Houſe of *David*, and upon the Inhabitants of *Jeruſalem*, the Spirit of Grace and Supplications; and they ſhall look on me, whom they have pierced; and they ſhall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only Son; and ſhall be in bitterneſs for him, as one that is in bitterneſs for his Firſt-born; and the Land ſhall mourn every Family apart," &c.

Give me leave, my Dear Friend, to expoſtulate with you, and lay my whole Heart before you, upon this moſt intereſting of all Subjects; and honeſtly confeſs, that I have been long affected with this heavy Charge, with which I have been ſo often preſſed by the *Chriſtians*, and greatly alarmed: becauſe it appears upon Examination to be Fact; and accounts for ſuch amazing difficulties, as upon any other Principle are inſuperable.

The *Meſſiah*, ſay they, has already been manifeſted to your Nation; and became the Son of Man, by being born of the Family of *David*: He came unto You, his own *peculiar* People; and you received him not, but hid your Faces from him; and "denied the Holy One and the Juſt, and deſired a Murderer to be granted unto you; and killed the Prince of Life (*m*): And for this Sin your Nation has been ſo long cut-

At *Hadarſon* in *Gen.* xxviii. de *Meſſiâ* filio *David* intelligit *Poli* Synopſ.

(*m*) *Acts* iii. 14.

off

off from all the *peculiar* Bleſſings, which it ſo long enjoyed under the Lord *Jehovah*; and you are diſperſed abroad, and become an Aſtoniſhment, a Proverb, and a Bye-word, among all Nations; as your Prophets foretold: nor will you ever be re-inſtated in his Favour, till you acknowledge him to be your Lord and King; and ſubmit yourſelves to his Government over You.

Eliſha Levi, look back upon the Days of Old; and the Mercies vouchſafed to our Fathers, by the hand of this *Jehovah Angel*; how often he declared his Love and tender Compaſſion to his peculiar people; yea, and his unchangeable Determination; that he never would forget them! "Can a Woman, ſays he, forget her ſucking Child; that ſhe ſhould not have Compaſſion on the Son of her Womb? Yea, She *may* forget; yet *will* not I forget Thee. Behold, I have graven Thee upon the Palms of my Hands; thy Walls are continually before me(*n*)."—And, even when it was neceſſary to puniſh us; with what Love and Tenderneſs does he compaſſionate our Sufferings! "How ſhall I give thee up, *Ephraim!* how ſhall I deliver thee, *Iſrael!* how ſhall I make Thee like *Admah!* how ſhall I ſet Thee as *Zeboim!* my Heart is turned within me, my Repentings are kindled together." And "who

(*n*) *Iſ.* xlix. 15, 16.

ſhall

ſhall have pity upon thee, O *Jeruſalem*; or who ſhall bemoan Thee, or who ſhall go aſide to aſk how Thou doeſt? Thou haſt forſaken me, ſaith *Jehovah*; thou art gone backward; therefore will I ſtretch out mine hand againſt Thee, and deſtroy Thee: I am weary of repenting(*o*)."

And is it poſſible; that ſo much *Reluctance* to puniſh, and ſo much *Tenderneſs*, as is every where expreſſed through the ſacred Volume towards our once happy Nation, ſhould on a ſudden, and for no apparent Cauſe, entirely deſert us? And we ſhould be thus caſt-off from his Favour, as we now are; and ſubjected to ſuch unſpeakable Ruin, as hath befallen the whole Nation; from the days of *Veſpaſian* and *Titus*? ſuch as never any other Nation under the Sun has undergone: and ſuffered in our Sieges, and Battles, by Seditions, and Famines, and Peſtilence, and Captivity, and Maſſacres, and Diſperſion? Is it poſſible; that all our Hopes in his indulgent Care and Love, ſhould thus at once be blaſted, for *no* Cauſe; and all his Promiſes to our Fathers fail us; and the bright and glorious Proſpect, the Birthright of our Nation, that in the Seed of *Abraham* all the Families of the Earth ſhould be bleſſed, thus end in eternal *Darkneſs* and *Oblivion*?—Surely, if ſome amazing Act of Wickedneſs has not

(*o*) *Hoſ.* xi. 8. *Jer.* xv. 5.

been perpetrated by *our* whole Nation(*p*), beyond what *other* Nations have committed; our preſent State and Condition, for ſo many Ages, is unaccountable; and our Scriptures incredible. And, what is the moſt melancholy of all Reflections; as we are ignorant of the Cauſe of theſe Afflictions(*q*), ſo we ſee no End of them; nor any means how to avert them.

In

(*p*) The Death of *Chriſt* was an Act of the whole Nation of the *Jews*; repreſented by their great Council: approved-of not only by the Inhabitants of *Jeruſalem*, but by all that came from different parts to celebrate the Paſſover. And, after *Chriſt*'s Reſurrection, when the Apoſtles preached to the *Jews*, wherever diſperſed; they were ſo far from condemning what the Senate at *Jeruſalem* had done, that they perſecuted his followers in all their Cities. Nor was their City deſtroyed; till the *Chriſtian* Doctrine had been preached, and rejected by the whole Nation: as *Chriſt* foretold. *Matt.* xxiv. 14. And the Modern *Jews* ſeem to approve of what their Fathers did. See *Limborch.* Amica Collat. p. 462, 497.

(*q*) As to what *Joſephus* ſays; that the City in no wiſe deſerved to be oppreſſed with ſuch miſery, ſave only that it foſtered and bred ſuch impious perſons, as wrought it's overthrow; it ſhews, that he was at a loſs to account for it. *Limborch* ſays; " Eo tempore & quatuor ad minimum poſt ſæcula, minima quæ unquam in gente *Judæa* Idololatriæ ſuſpicio; & maximus pro lege *Moſaica* fuit Zelus. Deus, contra promiſſa, contra morem ſuum, populum ſuum dilectum [cui parem in tota ejus Hiſtoria non reperimus] ruina caſtigavit & obruit; cum nulla erat publica a lege ſua defectio, nulla Nationis Apoſtaſia, nullum eximium crimen Rebellionis toti Genti imputandum!

In this dejected and forlorn State, ſifted into all Nations and become the Scorn of all Mankind, there yet remains *One* Hope, and *but* One, that can ſupport and relieve us; and this we have been blindly endeavouring, for many Ages, to invalidate and overturn; I mean the Authenticity and Truth of the *Chriſtian* Scriptures. If *Jeſus* be indeed the *Viſible Jehovah*, and *Angel* of the *Covenant*, whom our Fathers have *ſlain*; we want no farther Explanation, how we have offended him: or in what manner we may expect a Deliverance from our Evils. For He, whoſe Mercy and Loving-kindneſs have ſo often pardoned the Sins of our Fathers; delivering them from the Diſtreſſes, with which he viſited and chaſtiſed them; who could pray for his Enemies, in the midſt of his Sufferings, apologizing for their *wilful* Ignorance; and uſe that Power, which he gained by his patient Reſignation under Afflictions, for the Salvation of thoſe by whom he was diſtreſſed and ſlain: He will without doubt *return to us alſo*, in

dum! Si enim tollat Vir Doctiſſ. *Meſſiæ* rejectionem; nullum reperiet, nullum aſſignare poterit. *Limb.* p. 519, 530, 541. It is certain, there never was a time; when Idolatry was leſs in faſhion among them: it was not therefore the Supreme *Inviſible Jehovah*, but the *Viſible Jehovah*, [who was their Lord and King in a ſomewhat different ſenſe] whom our Fathers rejected: and it is no leſs certain at preſent, with regard to the Supreme *Inviſible Jehovah*; that we are not at all in Rebellion againſt him.

Mercy and Loving-kindneſs; and will *ſave us*, according to his Promiſe, even in the *latter* days (*r*); if we turn to him with Sorrow and Repentance, as to the *Angel* of the *Covenant* whom we delight in; and be obedient to his Voice. For that ſuch a Time will come, when we ſhall be again received into his Favour; we are well aſſured, both by the Propheſies of the *Jews* and *Chriſtians* (*s*).

St. *Paul*, in his Epiſtle to the *Romans*, ſpeaks very plainly to this purpoſe; when he warns them "not to be ignorant of this *Myſtery*, (leaſt they ſhould be wiſe in their own Conceits;) that Blindneſs *in part* hath happened to *Iſrael*, until the fulneſs of the *Gentiles* be come in; and

(*r*) *Deut.* iv. 30. "When thou art in Tribulation, and all theſe things are come upon you, even in the *latter* days; if thou turn to *Jehovah* thy God, and ſhalt be obedient to his Voice, he will not forſake thee." And, *Hoſea* iii. 4. "For the Children of *Iſrael* ſhall abide many days without a King, &c. afterward ſhall the Children of *Iſrael* return, and ſeek the Lord their God, and *David* their King: and ſhall fear the Lord and his Goodneſs in the *latter* days. See *Iſaiah* ii. 2. *Micah* iv. 1.

(*s*) We firmly and conſtantly believe, that God has divided the prefixed Time of our Slavery into two parts; the one of which is the Time appointed for our Converſion, and the other is the Term or End. And whenever the former of theſe Terms is compleated, the latter takes place. And if we were already converted, we ſhould immediately expect our Redemption, and the Accompliſhment of that Propheſy of the Law, *Deut.* xxx. 1—10. *R. Saadia*'s Treatiſe 8, § 2.

ſo,

ſo, if they abide not in unbelief, *all Iſrael* ſhall be ſaved(*t*)." And this ſhall be, when God ſhall turn-away Ungodlineſs from *Jacob*; and take away [the puniſhment of] their Sins." And St. *Luke* tells us, that "*Jeruſalem* ſhould be trodden-down of the *Gentiles*; until the time of the *Gentiles* be fulfilled(*u*):" which, St. *John* informs us, will be forty and two Months: or 1260 Years(*x*).

But the Events, which according to the Propheſies are to precede this happy Time are not yet fulfilled. *Chriſt* hath not yet the uttermoſt parts of the Earth for his Poſſeſſion(*y*). All People, Nations, and Languages, do not ſerve him(*z*). The Lord is not King over all the Earth; nor do all the Nations worſhip before him(*a*). For, as *Brerewood* obſerves, if we divide the Known World into *thirty* Parts; the

(*t*) *Rom.* xi. 25, &c. Not a little remnant only, as at the *firſt* Coming of *Chriſt*; but ALL *Iſrael:* And to this purpoſe, read *Iſ.* liv. 8, 9, 10.—lix. 20, 21.—lx. 14, 18, 19, 20.—lxi. 7, 8.—lxii. 4, 12.—lxv. 19.—lxvi. 22.—*Jer.* xxxii. 39, 40. *Ezek.* xxxiv. 28, 29.—xxxvii. 25, 26, 27.—xxxix. 28, 29. *Amos* ix. 15. Now ſcarce any of theſe Texts can be applied to the Captivity of *Babylon*. See *Whitby*. End of the Appendix to the xi. ch. of the Epiſtle to the *Romans*.

(*u*) *Luke* xxi. 24. (*x*) *Rev.* xi. 2. (*y*) *Pſ.* ii. 8. (*z*) *Dan.* vii. 14, 27. (*a*) *Micah* v. 4. *Zech.* xiv. 9. *Pſ.* lxii. 8.—lxxxvi. 9.—xlvii. 2, 7.

Chriſtian

Chriſtian Part will be only as *five*, the *Mahometans* as *ſix*, and the *Idolaters* as *nineteen*(*b*).

There are many other particulars foretold in the *Jewiſh*, and more explicitly in the *Chriſtian* Scriptures, which are to precede our Converſion; ſome of which will promote it: and, if we truſt to the Interpretation of the *Chriſtians*, there are ſome Events, which have happened in theſe latter Ages; which intimate, that the ancient Propheſies are haſtening to an Accompliſhment: particularly, the great Diminution in the Power of the *Roman* Church; and the preſent Wars of the *Turkiſh* Empire.

For the *Chriſtians* inform us, that the *Apocalypſe* was written about the year of *Chriſt* XC; and that the number of the Beaſt, [666] who was to ariſe out of the Sea(*c*), relates to the number of Years, from that time, till the Riſe of the Pope as a *temporal* Prince; the ſame tyrannical Power, which is ſpoken-of by *Daniel*(*d*). And it muſt be confeſſed; that the *Time* agrees to an exactneſs: for the Popes firſt became *temporal* Princes, by obtaining the Exarchate of *Ravenna*, in the year of *Chriſt* 756; and the year of *Chriſt* 90, added to the number 666, ends in that year; *i. e.* 756. And this power, as

(*b*) *Brerewood*, ch. xiv. (*c*) *Rev.* xiii. 18.
(*d*) *Dan.* vii. 24, 25. Sir *Iſaac Newton*, p. 250.

they

they obſerve, as propheſied-of both by *Daniel* and St. *John*, was to laſt 1260 years(*e*).

As this Propheſy threatens *Rome* (*f*); ſo another Propheſy is interpreted to bear as hard upon the *European* Kingdoms in general. The Interpreters univerſally allow the Beaſt to ſignify *Rome*; and we find it foretold, *Rev.* xvii. 12. that the ten Kings, into which the *Roman* Empire was divided, ſhould receive Power as Kings, one Hour with the Beaſt: μίαν ὥραν and *Bugenhagius* obſerves, that this muſt ſignify duration of Time: *i. e.* they ſhall receive the Power of Kings one Seaſon, or Portion of Time, with the Beaſt. Now theſe *ten* Kings, or Kingdoms, are explained by the *Chriſtians* to comprehend 1. The *Vandals* and *Alans*, in *Spain* and *Afric*. 2. The *Suevians*, in *Spain*. 3. The *Viſigoths*, in *France* and *Catalonia*. 4. *Alans*, in *Gaul*. 5. *Burgundians*. 6. *Franks*, in *Gaul*. 7. *Britons*. 8. *Huns*, in *Hungary*. 9. *Lombards*. 10. *Ravenna*(*g*). Upon this Propheſy, ſo explained, an

(*e*) *Dan.* xii. 7. *Rev.* xi. 2, 3.—xii 6, 14.

(*f*) *Rev.* xvii. 18.

(*g*) See Sir *Iſaac Newton* on the Propheſies; and *Machiavel*. Mr. *Mann* ſuppoſes the Temporal Power of the Pope to have begun in 727: when, under Pope *Gregory* the IId, the *Italians* rebell'd againſt *Leo*, upon the affair of Images. If ſo, the *Apocalypſe* might be written in the year 61, 3 or 4 years before the Epiſtles of St. *Peter* were written; and Sir *Iſaac Newton*'s opinion may be true, that they quote from the *Apocalypſe*.

Anony-

Anonymous Writer adds; "Let it be ſeriouſly remembered; that, as the *ten* Kings roſe together with the Beaſt; ſo by this Interpretation they are to ſink with *him*. When therefore this great *Babylon*, this Mother of Whoredoms and Abominations of the Earth, [which, in St. *John*'s time, reigned over the Kings of the Earth(*h*),] ſhall be brought to utter Deſtruction; *that* Event will be a Signal to all the *ten* Kingdoms, into which the old *Roman* Empire was divided; that their Deſtruction is approaching(*i*)." This ought certainly to be a warning to the *Proteſtant* Churches; who have received ſo many remarkable Bleſſings from the hand of God, ſince their Reformation from the Church of *Rome*; to purſue the ſame Principles, upon which they ſeparated; and to admit no one Article into their Eſtabliſhments, but what they can prove from Scripture; and not be tempted by empty Shadows, and the Appearance of Political and Secular Advantages to oppoſe the Truth: For it is very remarkable, and intereſting for them to conſider; that, in the Propheſy of *Daniel*, which is parallel to that of St. *John*, theſe *ten Kingdoms* are repreſented as the *Toes of the Image*; and their Deſtruction is in like manner foretold: "Then was the Iron, the Clay, the Braſs, the

(*h*) *Rev.* xvii. 5, 18.

(*i*) Notes on ſeveral Texts, p. 144. Suppoſed to be written by Mr. *Mann*.

Silver

Silver and the Gold, broken to pieces *together*; and became like the Chaff of the Summer Threſhing-floor, and the Wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the Stone [that is, the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah* which ſmote the Image] became a great Mountain; and filled the Earth(*k*)." By which it ſeems to look, as if the *Proteſtant* Churches would not make that advance in the purity of their Religion; which might reaſonably be expected from the State of Proſperity, and the great Advantages, they have for many years enjoyed(*l*).

I do

(*k*) *Dan.* ii. 35.

(*l*) The Author of an Eſſay on the Beauty of the Divine Œconomy, ſpeaking of the particular Happineſs, in this reſpect, of

"*England*, bound-in with the triumphant Sea."

the Bulwark of the Reformation, a ſafe retreat from the Tyranny of *Rome*, a Land of Learning and its Parent Liberty: obſerves—that it is the Duty of Men, ſo guarded from the Dangers that attend the ſearch of Truth in other Countries, ſo bleſſed with Time and Opportunity, ſo adorned with Learning and the free uſe of Scripture; to ſtudy the Word of God with Aſſiduity and Faithfulneſs: not as though they were *perfect* but ſearching after farther Improvement; confeſſing ingenuouſly, in the true Spirit of Proteſtantiſm, which diſclaims *Infallibility*; that if the Church of *England* ſhould, in every Doctrine it advances, "juſtify itſelf; its own Mouth would condemn it: and, if it ſhould ſay, I am perfect; it would prove it perverſe." *Job* ix. 20. It is the buſineſs of its Members, ſays that

I do not pretend to defend or object-to theſe Interpretations: but only obſerve; that, if they were actually *true*, we ſhould probably ſee the very ſame Face of things, both in the *Popiſh* and *Proteſtant* Churches, which we now do: *viz.* an utter Diſregard to the Truth, when in competition with political Views and worldly Intereſts; and a Determination to maintain the Errors of their ſeveral Eſtabliſhments, and the Traditions, and Doctrines, and Commandments of *Men*; though in many particulars they *know* them to be *falſe*: and an open and obſtinate Oppoſition to the Word of *God*, their own Conſciences, and that Power, which muſt infallibly overwhelm and cruſh them, if they continue to reſiſt it: for the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah* is deſcribed in the *Chriſtian* Scriptures, as a Stone; on which whoſoever falls, ſhall be broken, and on whomſoever it ſhall fall, it will grind him to

Writer, to bring it to perfection by Degrees: as they themſelves improve in the Knowledge of the Goſpel.—And if we preſs-on to farther Knowledge and Improvement; and are not grown *too Wiſe* and *Politic* to amend our Errors, when we find them; and to ſeparate the Chaff from the Corn: This Conduct, carried-on with Purity of Heart and Manners, and a Love and Charity to one another, will be the moſt rational Thankſgiving to God for his Mercies; and the moſt likely way, according to all human Appearance, of propagating the *Chriſtian* Religion. This was written in the Year 1759; before the Riſe of the preſent Diſputes about Subſcription to Articles.

pow-

powder(*m*), and *Daniel* ſays, it ſhall break and conſume all theſe Kingdoms; [among which are included the *Ten* already ſpecified] and it ſhall ſtand for ever (*n*): and the Iron, and the Clay, of which the Kingdoms are compoſed, are again foretold to be broken in pieces, in the next verſe. And this is all agreeable to the Conduct of Providence, in like Circumſtances, at other times. *Luke* viii. 18.—xix. 26. and particularly, ſee *Prov.* i. 24, &c.

Another Event, which the *Chriſtian* Scriptures ſpeak-of to be accompliſhed before our Converſion, according to the Interpretation of the *Chriſtians*; is the Ruin of the *Turkiſh* Empire. They tell us; that the four Kingdoms of the *Turks*, who were ſeated on the *Euphrates*, and were invaded by *Hulacu* in 1258; and then made war upon the *Greek* Empire, and took *Conſtantinople* in 1453; are propheſied-of in the *Revelation:* and were to reign an Hour, and a Day, and a Month, and a Year (*o*): which, according to the Prophetic Language explained in

(*m*) *Mat.* xxi. 44. (*n*) *Dan.* ii. 44.

(*o*) *Rev.* ix. 4. Or if this Period begins when they firſt began to ſlay or to make their Conqueſts (the word in the *Apoc.* ix. 15. being ἡτοιμασμενοι ἱνα αποκτεινωσι) about the year 1300, it will end in the latter end of the 17th century; at which time they were beaten by Prince *Eugene* in 1697; and they have, I think, made no progreſs ſince. (In a letter from an unknown hand).

Ezekiel(*p*), amounts to 391 years; and will therefore be completed in about *ſeventy* years: and that *he* [*viz.* the *Turk*] ſhall plant the Tabernacle of his Palace [after the loſs of *Conſtantinople*] between the Seas of the glorious holy Mountain, [in *Judæa*] according to the Prophet *Daniel*; yet ſhall he come to an End, and none ſhall help him(*q*). Theſe are the Computations of the *Chriſtians*; and, how true they may be, Time will diſcover. The Event, as Sir *Iſaac Newton* obſerves, will prove the Propheſy.

But one thing we may be certain of; that, before our Happineſs as a temporal State, and the return of the Theocracy, *Elias* will come and reſtore all things(*r*); for that Propheſy of *Malachi* does not ſeem to be compleatly and literally fulfilled, in the perſon of *John* the Baptiſt: who, though *He* came in the Power and Spirit of *Elias*; was not *Elias* himſelf in Perſon, as it ſeems to be the ſenſe of the Prophet(*s*): for

(*p*) *Ezek.* iv. 6.

(*q*) *Dan.* xi. 45. xii. 1. *Ezek.* xxxviii. xxxix. *Zech.* xii. 13, 14. &c.

(*r*) *Mal.* iv. 5, 6.

(*s*) *Mal.* iv. 5. *Matt.* xvii. 11.—xi. 14.

Chriſt calls *John* the Baptiſt *Elias*; becauſe he came in the Spirit and Power of *Elias*; *Luke* i. 17. It was cuſtomary, among the *Jews*, to call ſimilar Characters by one and the ſame Name. As when *Chriſt* is called *David*; and the Son of *Joſiah* is called *Shallum*: *Jer.* xxii. 11. And ſo *Rome* is called *Babylon*, in the New Teſtament.

Many

for we expect that what has happened at the *firſt* coming of the *Meſſiah* ſhall be more fully and literally compleated at his *ſecond* coming; and the blindneſs ſhall continue among the *Jews*, no longer than the *Chriſtian* Church of the *Gentiles* ſhall be compleated (*t*); and the receiving *Us* again into Favour ſhall be like Life from the Dead to *both* of us(*u*). And the Nations ſhall then ſee clearly, that *our* Peculiarity was intended for the general Benefit of all Mankind.

Then ſhall be fulfilled all thoſe great and glorious Promiſes recorded in the Prophets, which relate to the *Meſſiah*'s Advent as a *Prince*; that the *Gentiles* ſhall come to *our* Light, and Kings to the brightneſs of *our* Riſing; and Nations, which have not known *us*, ſhall run unto *us*: becauſe the Lord ſhall glorify *us*(*x*). And the Sons of Strangers ſhall build-up thy Walls; and their Kings ſhall miniſter unto Thee(*y*). For, thus ſaith the Lord: Behold, I will lift-up my Hand to the *Gentiles*; and ſet-up my Stan-

Many of the *Chriſtian* Fathers believed, that *Elias* would come in the *Body*; as he came by *John* in *Virtue* and *Spirit*. But whether this Propheſy will be fulfilled, according to the exact Letter, is uncertain; thus much we know of the matter, that *Elias* did not die; and therefore may poſſibly appear again in Perſon, before any Reſurrection from the Dead.

(*t*) See *Whitby*; Append. to the Epiſ. to the *Romans*, p. 100, &c.

(*u*) *Rom.* xi. 15. *Ezra* ix. 9. *Ezek.* xxxvii.

(*x*) *Iſaiah* lx. 3.—lv. 5. (*y*) *Iſaiah* lx. 10.

dard

dard to my People: and they ſhall bring thy Sons in their Arms, and thy Daughters ſhall be carried upon their ſhoulders: and Kings ſhall be thy nurſing Fathers, and Queens thy nurſing Mothers; they ſhall bow down to Thee with their Face upon the Earth, and lick up the Duſt of thy Feet; and thou ſhalt know, that I am the Lord: for They ſhall not be aſhamed, that wait for Me(z). And I will feed them that oppreſs thee with their own Fleſh; and they ſhall be drunken with their own Blood, as with ſweet Wine; and all Fleſh ſhall know, that I the Lord [*Jehovah*] am thy Saviour, thy Redeemer, the mighty One of *Jacob*(a)."

Excuſe me, my Dear *Eliſha*; if in a matter in which I think not only my Self, but my whole Nation, ſo greatly intereſted, I appear to indulge my Hope to an Exceſs; for it is the only Hope remaining to us: and, if it be well founded, as I am fully convinced it is; it is a Great and a Glorious one.

Sir *Iſaac Newton* obſerves; that, in the days of the ancient Prophets, when the ten Tribes were led into Captivity, the *Iſraelites* expected a *double* return; and that at the *firſt* the *Jews* ſhould build a new Temple, inferior to *Solomon*'s; until the time of that Age ſhould be fulfilled: and afterwards, that they ſhould return from all places of their Captivity; and build *Jeruſalem*

(z) *Iſaiah* xlix. 22, 23. (a) Ibid. ver. 26.

and

and the Temple glorioufly(*b*). And, to expreſs the Glory and Excellence of this City, it is figuratively ſaid to be built of precious Stones. *Jeruſalem* ſhall be built up with Sapphires and Emeralds, &c. And, if we look into the *Apocalypſe* of St. *John*; we ſhall ſee by the Deſcription which he there gives of the Heavenly *Jeruſalem*, the holy City, the Lamb's Wife(*c*); &c. that

(*b*) Sir *Iſaac Newton* on the Propheſies; p. 132. *Tobit* xiv. 4, 5, 6. *Tob.* xiii. 13, 16, 17. *Iſ.* liv. 12.

This rebuilding of *Jeruſalem* and the waſte Places of *Judah*, is predicted in *Mic.* vii. 11. *Amos* ix. 11, 14. *Ezek.* xxxvi. 33, 35, 36, 38. *Iſ.* liv. 3, 11, 12.—lv. 12.—lxi. 4. —lxv. 18, 21, 22. *Tobit* xiv. 5. And the Return from Captivity, and Coming of the *Meſſiah* and his Kingdom, are deſcribed in *Dan.* vii. *Rev.* xix. *Acts* i. 7, 8. *Matt.* xxiv. *Joel* iii. *Ezek.* xxxvi.—xxxvii. *Iſ.* lx.—lxii.—lxiii.—lxv.—lxvi. &c. Sir *Iſaac Newton*; p. 134.

(*c*) In the Old Teſtament, the *Jewiſh* Nation is ſaid to be *married* to *Jehovah*; *Jer.* xxxi. 32. and the Metaphor is uſed in many other Places. Hence her Idolatry is conſidered as *Adultery* and *Whoredom*; and ſhe is called an *Harlot*, *Jer.* iii. 8, 9.—xiii. 27. *Ezek.* xvi. 15. *Jer.* iii. 6. and God is *divorced* from her; *Iſ.* xlii. 4, 5. And as *Judah* and *Jeruſalem* are accounted *Harlots* (by reaſon of their Pollution), under the Names of *Aholah* and *Aholibah*; *Ezek.* xxiii. ſo the polluted *Chriſtian* Church is repreſented as an Harlot, in the *Apocalypſe*. But yet God hath not caſt-away his People; but, upon their Return, is ready to receive them again. "Turn, O backſliding Children; ſaith the Lord: for I am *Married* unto you." *Iſ.* lxii. 4. 5. *Jer.* iii. 14. And again; "Cry in the Ears of *Jeruſalem*, Thus ſaith the Lord; I remember the Kind-

that he ſpeaks of the ſame Times with *Tobit* and *Iſaiah*. For he ſays; "the Building of the Wall was of *Jaſper*, and the City of pure Gold;" &c. And he foretells ſuch a glorious Change of Affairs to be brought about, relative to the future Happineſs of our Nation; as he wants words to expreſs. And there can be no greater Proof, that the *Chriſtian* Religion is the Completion of the *Jewiſh* Revelation; and that the Love of God ſtill continues to our Nation; than the whole Scheme and Conduct of this Propheſy of the *Apocalypſe*: which was revealed to *Jeſus Chriſt* by the Supreme *Jehovah*; that he might ſignify it to St. *John*, by his Angel, *Rev.* i. 1.

Kindneſs of thy Youth; and the Love of thine *Eſpouſals*," &c. *Jer.* iii. 2.—And though the Branches of the Olive Tree are broken-off; yet the Root and the Stock remain, into which the *Chriſtian* Church is grafted; and when *Jeruſalem* ſhall ſeek *Jehovah* in the Latter Days, they ſhall be grafted into the ſame Stock; and become the Lamb's *Bride*; eſpouſed to one and the ſame *Huſband*, the *Viſible Jehovah*; in the ſame Senſe in which the *Jews* ſay, that *Moſes* eſpouſed *Iſrael* to God in Mount *Sinai*; when he made them enter into Covenant with him: [*Deverim Rabba*; c. vii. col. 4.] and in which St. *Paul* ſays to the *Corinthian* Converts, I have *eſpouſed* you to one Huſband; that I may preſent you as a chaſte Virgin to *Chriſt*.—And, *Rev.* xxi. this *Bride* is plainly deſcribed to be the holy City and the New *Jeruſalem*, and as a Bride adorned with her Jewels, to be married to the Lord; as our Nation is deſcribed, *Iſ.* lxi. 10.—lxii. 4, 5. See *Whitby* on the *Millennium*; p. 734.

and

and is entirely ordered according to the ancient *Jewiſh* Worſhip, upon the Feaſt of the ſeventh Month; and carried-on by Figures bearing Analogy, and relative to our Cuſtoms and Hiſtories. Twelve thouſand Saints of every Tribe of *Iſrael*, are deſcribed as ſealed with the Seal of the Living God; *Rev.* vii. 4. "And the *Tabernacle* of *God* [where the Angel *Jehovah* appeared in the Cloud] *ſhall be with Men*; and the *Shechinah*, or Glory of God, ſhall *lighten it*; and the *Lamb*, that is *Chriſt*, the *Angel Jehovah*, who uſed to appear in *Shechinah* to our Fathers, *ſhall be the Light thereof* (*d*). And he will dwell with them, and they ſhall be his People; and God ſhall wipe-away all Tears from their Eyes, and there ſhall be no more Death, neither Sorrow, nor Crying; neither ſhall there be any more Pain; and the New *Jeruſalem* ſhall deſcend from Heaven, prepared as a Bride adorned for her Huſband; and the Kings of the Earth ſhall bring their Glory and Honour into it; and the Saints of God ſhall reign with *Chriſt* a thouſand Years, even for ever and ever (*e*).

(*d*) *Rev.* xxi. 3, 23.

(*e*) Compare *Daniel* vii. with *Apocalyps.* xx.

Dan. vii. 9. I beheld till the *Thrones* were placed.	*Apoc.* xx. 4. And I ſaw *Thrones*; and they ſat upon them.
10. the *Judgement* was ſet.	And *Judgement* was given
22. and *Judgement* was given to the *Saints* of the Moſt High: and the *Saints* poſſeſſed the Kingdom.	unto *them*; and *they*, [the *Saints*] lived and reigned with *Chriſt* 1000 years.

And the Song of *Moſes*, which particularly propheſied of theſe Times, ſhall be joined with the Song of the *Lamb*(*f*). And all the ancient Propheſies ſhall be compleated, and the *Angel* of the *Covenant* ſhall be our Saviour, the Lord our Righteouſneſs; the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords(*g*). In ſhort, although our Sun hath been darkened, and our Moon hath not given her Light, for many Ages; yet the Day-ſpring from on high ſhall again viſit us(*h*), and the Sun of Righteouſneſs ariſe with healing in his Wings(*i*). For in my Wrath I ſmote thee, [ſays the Lord;] but in Favour have I had mercy on thee(*k*).—But all this Hope depends upon that *one* Truth, which we are ſo averſe to acknowledge; that *Jeſus* is the *Chriſt:* without which all is Darkneſs and Deſpair. For, as I have ſhewn, and I repeat it again; if the Propheſies are not *already* ſo far fulfilled in him *in part*, as to prove him to be the *Meſſiah*; they can *never* be fulfilled *at all.*

I can ſee no way to avoid the force of theſe Arguments: for, whether we allow or deny the Authenticity of the *Chriſtian* Scriptures, our Caſe will be equally deſperate: becauſe *They* are not only confirmed by ſtronger Evidence than *Ours*, but actually ſupport them. And to inſiſt that our Propheſies are true, and conſequently

(*f*) *Rev.* xv. 3. (*g*) *Ib.* xix. 16. (*h*) *Luke* i. 78.
(*i*) *Mal.* iv. 2. (*k*) *Iſaiah* lx. 10.

muſt

muſt come to paſs within the appointed Times, which are now elapſed; and then deny the Authority of the only Hiſtory in the World, that is able, or even pretends to account for their Completion, and ſupport their Credit; muſt appear to every ſenſible Man to be in effect a a plain Confeſſion, that the *Jewiſh* Syſtem is now become indefenſible. In ſhort; if we allow *their* Scriptures, we allow the *Meſſiah* to be come and *Jeſus* to be the Perſon; and if we deny *their* Scriptures, we are not able to defend *our own.*

And there can be no greater proof, that our Rabbins themſelves are ſenſible of this; than the methods they have taken to prevent an Examination into the Merits of the *Cauſe*, by forbidding us under an *Anathema*, to compute the Times(*l*). This may indeed keep our People for ſome time from diſcovering the Truth, and going over to *Chriſtianity*; and, as a *Proteſtant* Divine once ſaid in Praiſe of the Inquiſition, it may ſerve to *keep all things Tight.* But this effect will reach no farther than the *Synagogue.* It will neither prevent the Calculations of the *Chriſtians* or *Mahometans*; nor defend us againſt the Concluſion which they both agree in; that

(*l*) Non decet autem aliquem ſupputare tempus, aut curioſe elicere ex Verſibus: cognoſcetur Tempus adventus ejus, [ſc. *Meſſiæ*,] quemadmodum dixere Sapientes. *Cel.* m. in cap. *Chelek*; Illaqueëtur animus ſupputantium tempus. *Abravanel* de Cap. Fid. p. 7.

the *Meſſiah*'s Advent is already paſt; which we dare not inquire into.

And indeed, if this be the Caſe with Us; if we deny the Evidence of *Miracles*, by ſuppoſing them to be performed by *Magic*; and the Evidence of *Propheſies*, by denying them to be examined into, and their Completion aſcertained; what Proof of *our own* Religion will remain?

Theſe Arguments, out of many, I have choſen to lay before You; becauſe they have been moſt convincing to Me, and ſeem fully to determine the Queſtion between us; as being the leaſt liable to cavil and uncertainty. Among thoſe which I have omitted, in proof of *Chriſtianity* in general, the Evidence which ariſes from the perpetual Correſpondence between the two Revelations is not the leaſt: the one of which is a plain Counter-part to the other: One, the *Seal* or *Type*; the Other, the *Impreſſion* or *Antitype*; anſwering to it in a thouſand Particulars: But, this internal Proof will not be apprehended, in its full force, by thoſe who are not ſatisfied of the Divine Original of both. But, when the Divinity of them is once acknowledged, there appears in almoſt every Chapter of the New Teſtament, ſome Hint, Reference, or Doctrine; which either explains, or fulfills, or farther continues, or confirms, the ſame Scheme of Providence, which we learn from *our own* Scriptures,

in

in a conſiſtent, intelligible, and very extraordinary manner.

And, what appears to me another wonderful Confirmation of this Divine Original of the *Chriſtian* Scriptures, of the *internal* Kind, (for I ſhall ſay nothing here of the *external* Proof;) is this: that the more the World improves in the Knowledge of Truth, eſpecially with regard to the Nature and Attributes of *God*, and the moral Excellence of *Man*, beyond what was known in former Days; the more they find their Sentiments agree with thoſe Writings: which ſeems a plain Proof, to an *unprejudiced* Mind; that no Man or Set of Men in the World, were capable of compoſing them; without a divine Revelation. On the contrary; had they been of human Compoſition, we ſhould have found them full of the Errors of ſome old Philoſophy; and incapable of ſtanding the Examination of the preſent Ages. Whereas, in truth, we find no Syſtem of Religion or Morals, that is worth regarding; any farther than it agrees with theſe Books, and will ſtand the Examination of that Teſt.

When I conſider all theſe Arguments; and find the End, for which the Divine Power interpoſes in the Affairs of Men, is the performance of that Promiſe of Bleſſedneſs, which *Jehovah* firſt obſcurely hinted to *Adam*, and afterwards more explicitly gave to *Abraham*, that in his Seed

Seed ſhould all the Families of the Earth be bleſſed; and afterwards ſtill more plainly by *Iſaiah*; that the *Meſſiah*, or *Chriſt*, ſhould become a Light to the *Gentiles*, and the Salvation of God to the End of the Earth; extending the Bleſſing from *our* Nation, to the whole race of Man; and from this World, to the next; thereby bringing all good Men, whoſe Principles ſhall fit them to promote Virtue and Happineſs, into an eternal Kingdom that ſhall never be deſtroyed; under the Care and Government of the *Jehovah Angel*, who creäted us, and hath taken care of us from the Beginning.—When I farther conſider; that the *Chriſtian* Scheme, by which all this is to be brought about, is not only perfectly agreeable to our higheſt Notions of the infinite Goodneſs of the great Lord and Governor of the Univerſe; but entirely conformable to the uſual Method of his Providence, in renewing his Revelations to Mankind, as the Evidence and good Effects of former Revelations failed, through length of Time, and the Careleſſneſs and Wickedneſs of the World:—When I ſee all theſe Truths join to complete One plain, rational and conſiſtent Deſign, agreeable to our own Scriptures, and our moſt ſanguine hopes in the Promiſes made to our Fathers, I think myſelf not only obliged to confeſs my Belief, that *Jeſus* is the *Chriſt*; but alſo to produce my Proofs, and explain to my Friends the Strength of the Evi-

Evidence, by which I have been convinced, and the Reaſons of ſo great a Change of my Sentiments: that if my preſent Opinion be agreeable to Truth, it may prevail with others; and if not, that I may at leaſt appear to them not to have acted raſhly or precipitately; and may give an opportunity to thoſe who diſapprove of my Conduct, to examine my Arguments; and either allow of them, or convince me of their weakneſs.

I know, that I have already forfeited the Eſteem of many worthy and good Men, whom I highly Love and Honour; and have expoſed myſelf to much reproach and ill-will from Others, who have never wiſhed me well. And, on the other hand, I am well aware; that I ſhall not approve myſelf to the *Chriſtians*, whoſe cauſe I plead; and whoſe Scriptures I believe. But you, my Friend, who are ſo thoroughly acquainted with my Principles, and the uprightneſs of my Intentions, from my Youth; and have known me in Proſperity and Adverſity, always the ſame; will continue to Love the Man; whatever you may think of his Opinions in Matters of Religion.

I am, &c.

END OF VOL. I.

Directions to the Binder.

Contents of Letters I, II, III, IV, to follow Title and Preface; Contents of Letters V, VI, VII, VIII, to follow the Title of the Second Volume; and the Index, to be laſt.